



401.5
C86

270.880
2¹/₂



1907



Presented by

Ex libris

Miss Mary Balson

GIRTON COLLEGE LIBRARY



062503

LIFE AND LETTERS
OF
MANDELL CREIGHTON, D.D.
VOL. II.

WORKS BY MANDELL CREIGHTON, D.D.

SOMETIME BISHOP OF LONDON.

A HISTORY OF THE PAPACY FROM THE GREAT
SCHISM TO THE SACK OF ROME, 1378-1527.
6 vols. Crown 8vo. 5s. net each.

HISTORICAL ESSAYS AND REVIEWS. Crown 8vo.
5s. net.

HISTORICAL LECTURES AND ADDRESSES.
Crown 8vo. 5s. net.

THOUGHTS ON EDUCATION. Crown 8vo. 5s. net.

THE CHURCH AND THE NATION: Charges and
Addresses. Crown 8vo. 5s. net.

THE MIND OF ST. PETER, AND OTHER SER-
MONS. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. net.

UNIVERSITY AND OTHER SERMONS. Crown 8vo.
5s. net.

PERSECUTION AND TOLERANCE: being the Hul-
sean Lectures preached before the University of Cambridge
in 1893-4. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.

QUEEN ELIZABETH. With Portrait. Crown 8vo.
5s. net.

MEMOIR OF SIR GEORGE GREY, BART., G.C.B.,
1799-1882. With Portraits and other Illustrations. Crown
8vo. 6s. net.

CARLISLE. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. (*Historic Towns.*)

SIMON DE MONTFORT. Fcp. 8vo. 2s. 6d. (*Histori-
cal Biographies.*)

THE AGE OF ELIZABETH. With 5 Maps and 4
Genealogical Tables. Fcp. 8vo. 2s. 6d. (*Epochs of Modern
History.*)

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO., 39 Paternoster Row
London, New York, and Bombay.



Photo. Russell & Sons

Walter L. Golla Photo

Gourryth, London.



LIFE AND LETTERS

OF

MANDELL CREIGHTON

D.D. OXON. AND CAM.

SOMETIME BISHOP OF LONDON

HON. FELLOW OF MERTON COLLEGE OXFORD AND EMMANUEL COLLEGE CAMBRIDGE :
D.C.L. OXFORD AND DURHAM : LL.D. GLASGOW AND HARVARD: LITT.D. OF DUBLIN :
FELLOW OF THE SOCIETÀ ROMANA DI STORIA PATRIA :
MEMBER OF THE MASSACHUSETTS HISTORICAL SOCIETY AND OF THE
AMERICAN CHURCH HISTORY SOCIETY :
PROFESSOR OF ANCIENT LITERATURE AT THE ROYAL ACADEMY :
MEMBER OF HER MAJESTY'S MOST HONOURABLE PRIVY COUNCIL

BY HIS WIFE

‘I determined to know nothing among you save Jesus Christ’

IN TWO VOLUMES—VOL. II.

WITH PORTRAITS

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON

NEW YORK AND BOMBAY

1904



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2023 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

CONTENTS

OF

THE SECOND VOLUME

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. BEGINNING OF EPISCOPAL LIFE Consecration—Death of Dr. Magee—Enthronement— Life at Peterborough—Church Restoration. LETTERS	I 19
II. EPISCOPAL ADMINISTRATION Church Extension—Leicester and Northampton—Ordina- tions—Relations with Clergy—Religious Education— Diocesan Organisation—Clerical Problems.	23
III. LIFE AT PETERBOROUGH Literary Work—Social life—Travels—Birmingham Church Congress—‘History of the Papacy,’ vol. v.—The Hulsean Lectures—Primary Charge. LETTERS	70 101
IV. THE STRIKE IN THE BOOT AND SHOE TRADE Relations with working-men—Strike in the shoe trade— Lectures to working-men.	113
V. THE CORONATION AT MOSCOW. Travels—Sermons—Norwich Church Congress—Life of Queen Elizabeth—Journey to Russia—The Romanes Lecture—Death of James Creighton—Shrewsbury Church Congress—The validity of Anglican orders. LETTERS	133 182
VI. APPOINTMENT TO LONDON Congratulations on appointment—Farewell to Peter- borough—Confirmation.	197

CHAPTER	PAGE
VII. BEGINNINGS OF LONDON LIFE	217
Life at Fulham—Lecture on the Picturesque in History—Society—The Log of the 'Mayflower'—The House of Lords—The Jubilee—The Lambeth Conference—Travels—Ruridecanal Conferences.	
LETTERS	250
VIII. THE BISHOP AND HIS CLERGY	261
Church difficulties—Appointments—Curates—Preaching—Religious Communities—Business capacities—Clerical problems.	
IX. RITUAL DIFFICULTIES	284
Church opinions—St. Ethelburga's—St. Cuthbert's—Speech in the House of Lords—Additional Services—St. Albans—Reservation—The position of the Church of England.	
X. LONDON LIFE, 1898	316
The Co-operative Congress—Mr. Gladstone's funeral—Divorce—Travels—Relations with his Sons—Religious Education—Peace Meeting—London University Commission.	
LETTERS	341
XI. THE LAMBETH HEARING	351
The Holborn Meeting—Speech in the House of Lords—Confession—The Diocesan Conference—The Archbishop's Hearing—Opinions about his decision—The Bishop's letter to the Rural Deans—His efforts to secure obedience.	
XII. THE LONDON CHURCH CONGRESS	385
Lectures—Lucerne—The Diocesan Conference—Travels—The Church Congress—The War in South Africa—Visits to Windsor and Sandringham.	
LETTERS	406
XIII. THE LAST YEAR	421
The Bishop's New Year's Message—Visitation and Charge—Letters on Church questions—Committees on Bishops' Registries and Local Records—Holiday—Illness—Round Table Conference—Attempted prosecution by Colonel Porcelli—The Biarritz Chaplaincy—Illness and death—Funeral	
LETTERS	466
XIV. CHARACTERISTICS AND SAYINGS	479

APPENDICES

	PAGE
PRAYER AT MR. GLADSTONE'S FUNERAL	509
LETTER ON RELIGIOUS EDUCATION	509
POEMS	512
BIBLIOGRAPHY	517
INDEX	523

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

PHOTOGRAVURE PLATES

FULL-LENGTH PORTRAIT IN ROBES *Frontispiece*

From a Photograph by Russell & Sons, 17 Baker Street, W.

PORTRAIT, *ætat.* 55 *To face p. 284*

From a Photograph by Russell & Sons, 17 Baker Street, W.

PORTRAIT, IN THE PALACE GARDEN, PETERBOROUGH,

1893 „ 83



LIFE

OF

MANDELL CREIGHTON

CHAPTER I

BEGINNING OF EPISCOPAL LIFE

CREIGHTON'S consecration as Bishop of Peterborough was fixed for St. Mark's day. After Easter, as he was badly in want of rest, we went to Devonshire. But on the first night of our holiday, he was seized with a severe attack of muscular rheumatism, and we had to return to Worcester after only two days' absence. He soon recovered sufficiently to go and stay with the Humphry Wards at Haslemere, whilst the necessary arrangements were being made for our move to Peterborough, and he found the refreshment he needed in rambling amongst the Surrey hills. He went up to London for his Confirmation in the Church of St. Mary-le-Bow on April 23, and stayed with his old college friend Mr. H. J. Hood, whose house he was allowed to use as if it were his own during the years that he was Bishop of Peterborough. He never at any time had to go to a hotel, but always found an affectionate welcome from Mr. and Mrs. Hood whenever he had to go to London.

He was consecrated in Westminster Abbey, together with Dr. Randall Davidson, who then became Bishop of Rochester. Creighton was presented by the Bishops of Carlisle and Lichfield. The sermon was preached by Dr. Butler, Master of Trinity College, Dr. Davidson's former headmaster, who spoke of the new Bishop of Peterborough as 'the loyal son

of two great Universities, who had won for himself in no common degree the regard and confidence of both,' and went on to say, 'He has thought and written much on the history of the Church at not a few of its most momentous crises. On such high subjects he ranks, by common consent, among our leading authorities. Further, to all this contact with the world of learning and of so-called leisure, he has added the much valued cure of a country parish. This experience, so large and so varied, should surely also be a discipline.'

The evening after his Consecration the Bishop had to go to Cambridge, where he was engaged to preach the University Sermon on the following day. An immense congregation gathered to hear him, amongst them many who seldom entered a church. He took as his subject the training of character, and spoke of what life in a University could do to train the scholar, the man of high moral principle, the philanthropist, but showed that none of these ideals in themselves were able to give that large outlook on life which could only come from religion, 'the one reconciler of human activities, the one vivifying power of life.' His choice of subject was determined by his observation of University life, which had led him to conclude that the very existence of the high standard which there prevailed was almost a hindrance to true spiritual religion; when all surrounding influences made for a worthy and dignified life, some men seemed to slip gradually out of any sense of the need of religion for their own soul's life. His last message to the University, on severing his direct connexion with it, was to assert that the life which shut out God must grow narrower day by day, and that infinite possibilities were alone opened out to man by 'the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus our Lord.'¹

The next few days were spent in London at Convocation. The Bishop's first public appearance in his diocese was fixed for May 5, when he was to consecrate a new church at Leicester. It proved to be a melancholy and trying day; for as he entered the church he was told of the sudden death of his

¹ This sermon is printed in *The Heritage of the Spirit*, under the title 'The Christian Character.'

predecessor, the Archbishop of York. Gloom settled upon all those present. Dr. Magee had been deeply interested in the church, and had himself said to his successor, 'I hope that your first act will be to consecrate St. Hilda's Church in Leicester.' In his sermon at the Consecration, the Bishop said that, as a stranger, he could not venture to speak to them of one whom they had known so long, but he asked them, as they took possession that day of their new church, to associate it with the memory of one who would always be known as 'the great Bishop of Peterborough.' Afterwards, at the public lunch, he said that, though it would be unseemly for him to speak much about himself, he must thank them warmly for their reception and for the loyal co-operation which they had promised him; what little work he might be enabled to do must be done entirely through the clergy. His main business must be to go from one place to another, and use the experience gained in one part of the diocese for the benefit of the whole; upon the readiness of the clergy to co-operate with him and give him their advice and support any fruitful results of his episcopate must depend.

The vigorous administration of Dr. Magee during his episcopate of twenty-two years had left the Diocese in excellent order. The special gifts of the two men were so different as hardly to suggest comparison between them, but the fact that both were noted for epigram and wit, though the nature of their humour was very different, led to a frequent confusion of their smart sayings, and, in this respect at least, the distinction between the two Bishops of Peterborough was not always kept clear, and probably never will be. The character of Dr. Creighton's preaching and speaking, though absolutely different from the splendid oratory which had delighted the diocese of Peterborough, was still so full of interest and attraction of another kind as seldom to disappoint even audiences accustomed to his predecessor. Dr. Bigg writes:

'As a speaker, he was amazingly ready; all his knowledge, all his powers were instantaneously at command. He did not care for eloquence, indeed he despised it; what he aimed at was instruction, and for this he always looked more to principles than to facts. He was not moving or pathetic, but

stimulating and persuasive. His voice filled the largest building without an effort, and yet did not raise an echo. People, especially men, flocked to hear him both at Worcester and Peterborough. He was never rhetorical or sensational, but you carried away the impression of a man who had given not his heart only, but a fine intelligence, to the cause which he preached.'

Mr. W. M. Heygate, a prominent Leicestershire layman, wrote :

'I shall never forget the wonderful success of his presidential address at his first Diocesan Conference. After the well-known eloquence of his predecessor, to which we had been long accustomed, it was a matter of astonishment to find that our new Bishop could be almost as eloquent, and the general remark was "We've got another Magee."'

Everyone was struck with his rapid and yet lucid speaking, and his epigrammatic style. He was always ready to speak or preach wherever he was needed, and could do so with very little special preparation, if necessary with no preparation at all. He was determined to go everywhere and see everything for himself. His frankness, his easy manner, his apparently unguarded conversation at first surprised and puzzled people. A Bishop so accessible to everybody was a novelty to them ; but it was not long before his invariable brightness and kindness won all hearts. Dr. Magee's age and delicate health had made it impossible for him to go about the diocese as freely as Dr. Creighton was able to do. The difference between the two men is shown in the following story recorded by one of the clergy :

'His [Dr. Creighton's] relation to the younger clergy could not be better illustrated than by his own transposition of the *mot* which his predecessor once uttered at an Academy dinner. Dr. Magee had said that a certain picture in his possession inspired him with such kindly feelings that "I do assure you, gentlemen, a curate could play with me." "Now I," said Dr. Creighton (in relating the story) "should have felt more inclined to play with the curate."'

The first public appearance of the Bishop in his Cathedral was on the occasion of Dr. Magee's funeral on May 9.

To the Rev. Canon Melville

‘May 10, 1891.

‘Dear Melville,—Of course the death of the Archbishop has cast a cloud over everything. I apprehend that never before did a new bishop enter on his episcopate just when his predecessor died and was buried in his Cathedral, where my first appearance was at his funeral. The position of his family was most melancholy: recovering from influenza, summoned hastily to a London hotel, having a huge house all in confusion and no home, and nowhere to go to, from the sad change. I could only imagine what would be the condition of my own family if I had died just now; works of all kinds begun, expenses incurred, everything upside down, and all for nothing. It is most deplorable. I cannot imagine a sadder state of things. And of course it is an anomalous circumstance that the clergy were summoned yesterday to my predecessor’s funeral, and next Saturday to my enthronement. I am only glad to hear that Saturday is an awkward day.

‘I am summoned to do homage to-morrow. I shall be glad when formalities are over and I can settle to humdrum work.’

The next week, after doing homage at Windsor on Monday and attending a Bishops’ meeting at Lambeth on Tuesday, he was already in full work, holding four Confirmations, and returning to Peterborough to be enthroned on Saturday, May 19. Amongst the large concourse of clergy who assembled in the Cathedral was the Bishop’s former head-master at Durham, Dr. Holden, now the incumbent of a small country living in the diocese, and delighted to welcome his old pupil as his diocesan.

The Bishop gave no address at his enthronement, and preached for the first time in the Cathedral on the following Sunday, when the Mayor and Corporation attended in state. He made no personal allusions in his sermon, but spoke of the power that came through the gift of the Holy Spirit.

The next week the Ordination candidates were to arrive at the Palace, in preparation for the Ordination on the following Sunday. The workmen were not yet out of the house, and everything was still in confusion, when, in the midst of all the demands made upon him by his new work, the Bishop was taken ill with influenza. He had to hold many business interviews in bed, and was so weak and

depressed that he was unable to give a Charge to the candidates, though he managed to see them individually and to hold his Ordination. He soon regained strength and energy. On the following Tuesday, having a spare hour, he spent it over his 'History of the Papacy,' and the rest of the week was taken up by a Confirmation tour.

In such spare moments as he had, he helped to superintend the arrangements of his house, and himself worked hard at hanging pictures. The Palace at Peterborough is a rambling and somewhat inconvenient house, which has grown up round the old Abbot's Hall. The additions made to it at different times had not always increased its beauty, and, with some interesting features, there was much about the house to grieve anyone with a feeling for architecture. The Bishop at once began to consider how it might be improved, and planned some work to be carried out in the autumn. The plaster which covered the stonework of the front of the house, the wall of the Abbot's Hall, was removed, and revealed an interesting lancet window. The square sashes of the windows on the first floor were replaced by stone mullions, and a few years later the same improvement was effected in another wing which looked towards the garden. The chapel, a plain modern building, had so far received little decoration. Here the Bishop called in the aid of Mr. C. E. Kempe, who painted the roof, lined the apse with decorated wooden panels, and adorned the altar with a wooden reredos with figures carved at Ober-Ammergau.¹

These improvements were carried out in successive years, as the Bishop was able to afford them. He regarded the Palace as a building held in trust by him, which he was bound to care for and improve as much as he could. The portraits of his predecessors, belonging to the Palace, were cleaned, restored and rehung in chronological order, and he tried to obtain engravings or other portraits of those bishops of whom there was no picture. He instituted a log-book at the Palace, in which all changes made in his day were recorded, and hoped that his successors would keep it up, so that a continuous history of the place might be secured. Very soon after his coming, he began to collect

¹ This reredos was afterwards taken to Fulham.

books and pictures relating to the history of the Diocese. He arranged them in a bookcase in the hall, and it was his wish that anyone should feel at liberty to come and consult them. It was a constant interest to him to add to this collection, which, on his departure, he left behind as a gift to the Palace.

Much was also done to improve the garden. New lawns and flower borders were laid out, but it was a work of difficulty, for the poor soil and the smoke from the brickfields and the railways made gardening a constant disappointment. The Bishop's desire was to make the Palace useful to the whole Diocese, a comfortable house where all might find a welcome. He had no wish to change his own simple ways of living. He kept no carriage, because, living so near to a station, it was not necessary for his work. He always traveled without a servant, and tried not to let his visits disturb even the humblest vicarage. The only change he made in his personal habits was to travel first class so as to save himself fatigue, and more often secure solitude. Of course the large house and the many guests entailed a considerable number of servants, but he constantly endeavoured to remind his children that it was only his office that made him live on a large scale, and that he wished their habits to be as simple as possible. He felt acutely the disadvantage to children of growing up in the surroundings of an important official position. Writing to his son's head-master he said :

'The thing that weighs upon me is the difficulty, and the absolute necessity, of a man who holds a dignified official position making his children understand that they have to make their own way in the world. You may tell them so, and they assent, but they come home and find things comfortable, and intend in the future to do the same. Hence my desperate desire to have things perfectly understood on my side.'

But combined with personal simplicity went a strong sense of the dignity of his office. It was that, as well as his historical sense, which led him to accept the cope and mitre which his friend Mr. Offley Wakeman presented to him. Of course he was attacked by some for appearing in cope and mitre, but on the whole it made little disturbance, for he only

wore them in the Cathedral at great functions or in parishes where the incumbents desired it.

Surrounded as it is on more than two sides by great stretches of reclaimed fenland, Peterborough has not perhaps much to recommend it as a place of residence. Indeed its inhabitants are wont to say that its great advantage is the excellent railway service which makes it such an easy place to get away from. But the Bishop was determined to like it and to see all the beauty that could be found in his new surroundings. It was an abiding source of joy to him to live under the shadow of the Cathedral, which formed the background to his garden. He soon knew and loved every stone of the mighty Norman church, and was actively interested in the successive schemes of restoration by which, of late, its beauty and security have been so much increased. As at Worcester, he loved to take his friends and others round the Cathedral, and would spend hours in showing them every corner inside and out, taking them over the roof and up the towers, and explaining the history of the building, as he pointed out the rich variety of its beauty. One of a party from Toynbee Hall taken round by him writes :

‘He began his explanation by saying, “Whenever you try to understand an old Cathedral, your first question should be: When did the middle of it tumble down? because it always did at some time. In many cases the centre gave way before the building was finished.” He took us on to the roof and made us notice the difference between the western towers, saying it was always so in Gothic work; there was never slavish imitation, always freshness and character. Below in the Cathedral he gave us one of his wonderful historical sketches of the times and the circumstances when the work was done, carrying us from the Norman invasion to the destructive work of Cromwell’s army.’

In every possible way the Bishop used the Cathedral as a centre of diocesan life. As he said in a paper read before the Exeter Church Congress in 1894 :

‘The Bishop’s church must rank as the chief church, and is the natural meeting place for every branch of diocesan organisation. The usefulness of such gatherings for impressing the need of unity and co-operation is incalculable. . . . It is through the sense of diocesan unity that the larger unity of

the Church can best be realised. Every opportunity should be taken to bring people from all parts of the Diocese to their Cathedral. The mere sight of its splendid fabric produces an impression that is not easily forgotten.'

It is sometimes considered a possible source of friction that a bishop should live in his Cathedral city, but the happy relations which existed from the first between Dr. Creighton and his Chapter were never marred by disagreement. He found it a great help to have a body of advisers close at hand whose experience of the Diocese was longer than his own. As he said in the Church Congress paper already quoted, 'The Cathedral still provides helpers and counsellors for the Bishop. Deans and Canons are in my experience most ready to help him with their knowledge and advice, to represent him when necessary in the Diocese, to undertake delicate commissions.

The Chapter Library, which, though small, contained many curious books, soon attracted his interest. There was no regular librarian, and the Bishop found the books in a rather dirty and neglected condition. At his suggestion the Canons' wives set to work and dusted them, and when he had time he would hunt out the treasures of the library and select some of the more damaged volumes to be repaired or rebound at his expense.

As always, he began at once to study the country round his new home. Every free afternoon was spent in taking a walk till he knew every inch of the neighbourhood. On these walks he was often accompanied by all his children, and the long procession of parents and children, as they passed through the streets of Peterborough and along the neighbouring lanes and footpaths, afforded much interest and amusement to the inhabitants. A frequent walk was along the great dyke made by Bishop Morton in the fifteenth century to keep out the floods, which runs into the fen for many miles. The Bishop loved the great sweep of sky and the varying effects of light over the wide stretches of the fen. His other favourite walk was amongst the beautiful trees and great thornbushes of Milton, Mr. Fitzwilliam's park, near Peterborough. On all the roads along which he went, he learnt to know the children, and would stop and speak to them as they opened a gate for him, or as he met them coming out of school.

But the days at home were few ; the greater part of his life was spent in travelling about his diocese. At his first public speech in Northampton he said that his experience of a bishop's life was that it was like that of a commercial traveller, because he was always going somewhere with a bag in his hand. Peterborough seems at first sight to be situated in a most inconvenient position for the residence of the Bishop. It lies on what Bishop Jeune called the stalk of a pear-shaped diocese. The inconveniences of this situation are to some extent compensated for by the railway communications. The diocese consists of the three counties of Leicester, Northampton and Rutland. The two great centres of population, Leicester and Northampton, have little communication with one another, though both can be easily reached from Peterborough. But the journeys took a great deal of time, as all the trains about the diocese were slow. The Bishop did not much object to this, for he could prepare sermons and speeches and do a great deal of reading in the train. But he had to spend many nights away from home. As a rule, he tried to be at Peterborough on Sunday, but he was constantly away for three or four days together during the week. He generally stayed with the clergy, and valued the opportunity of getting to know them and their families in their home life. He was also a welcome guest in most of the great houses of the diocese. Wherever he went, he made friends with the children. They were his delight and his recreation, and he would come home full of stories of the new child friends he had made. There was always a long list of special friends amongst the children of the clergy to whom books and other presents had to be sent at Christmas ; and it was often said that he would certainly be known as 'the children's bishop.'

In a certain sense, he was quite new to his work. He had never mixed in church politics, he had very little personal acquaintance with leading ecclesiastics. I think that the only bishop whom he had ever visited, except his own diocesans in Durham, Newcastle and Worcester, was Bishop Stubbs, with whom his relations were literary rather than ecclesiastical. He had never been a member of Convocation, or attended church meetings in London. It is true that his work in the

diocese of Newcastle had given him experience in the details of diocesan administration, and he had seen a good deal of church life at Worcester, through going about to many different parishes to preach, and through his work as examining chaplain. But he was a stranger to the larger world of church affairs, and was himself little known to church dignitaries, except through his occasional appearances at church congresses. He did not begin his new life with any formulated policy or definite scheme of work in his mind. Perhaps the leading ideas at the bottom of his episcopal activity, though he never stated them or formulated them, and they were in truth nothing more than the expression of his whole life and character, were the effort to promote unity and co-operation amongst all sorts and conditions of men, the constant wish to stimulate everywhere the pursuit and love of knowledge, and so to be true to the spirit of the Church of England, which rests its claim on sound learning, and, as regards his own conduct, the constraining desire to show kindness and sympathy to all men. This was from no wish for popularity. He cared nothing for that, nor for what men thought of him. He never read newspapers to see how his utterances were taken; indeed none of the local newspapers published in the diocese were taken in at the Palace. But he was animated by an ever-growing sense of the necessity to love those with whom he was brought into contact. This told most specially in his relations with the young. If, at first, he sometimes puzzled the older clergy, the younger clergy loved him at once. His look, his hand on their shoulder, a few words, were enough to make them feel that he was to them a real Father in God. The absolute sincerity of his interest was manifest at once, no one could suspect it of being official. It was the consciousness that his work brought him into contact with so many human souls, and that his position gave him opportunity to say words of encouragement or comfort which would be remembered, that cheered him through all the weary toil of administrative detail.

His clear head and admirable business capacities made it easy for him to grasp the formal duties of his new position. He wrote on June 13, 1891: 'I am struck with the capacity one possesses to develop new activities when called upon to

do so.' His chief object was to see and observe. In one of his first speeches he said : ' I have no scheme of episcopal activity : I only wish to watch and see what can best be done. I do not wish to be over-anxious, over-active, or over-cautious.' He described himself as ' a man wandering about the world to pick up any information which might be of use to him.' Whenever he spoke in either of his big towns—Leicester or Northampton—he tried to make his hearers feel that he belonged to them and was in no sense apart from any of their interests. Speaking in Northampton once, he said that he should not be content till, as he passed men in the street, they said : ' There goes our Bishop,' and then he hoped they would go on to say, ' There goes my Bishop.'

The rapidity with which he got to know his Diocese was surprising. Dr. A. T. Lyttelton (the late Bishop of Southampton) writes :

' What chiefly struck me about his diocesan work was his grasp. At Peterborough he seemed to obtain with apparently great ease and rapidity a knowledge of the clergy, and of the different parishes which I have never seen equalled. More than most bishops, he relied on personal and informal intercourse with his clergy as the means of getting to know them. This he could do with the greater ease that he was singularly accessible and always ready to talk.'

Mr. Grose Hodge (then incumbent of Holy Trinity, Leicester) says :

' He seemed to get into touch with the Diocese almost at once. And with him the Diocese did not mean the clergy. He was the least clerically-minded bishop that ever was. His interests were those of men generally. He accepted whenever he could invitations to stay with laymen. Our business men felt they were quite as likely to get the Bishop as the squire was. In scores of country houses throughout the diocese, Nonconformist as well as Church, a truer idea of the aims and methods of the Church started with the Bishop's visit. . . . His intercourse with the clergy was close and confidential. He guided us by personal influence rather than by general directions.'

Mr. W. M. Heygate writes :

' The most remarkable point in his character was the universality of his knowledge and the rapidity with which he

picked up and digested every new subject. He was utterly ignorant of the Midlands when he was first appointed, and yet, before he had been Bishop of Peterborough a year, he seemed to know the history and the geography and the distinguishing characteristics of his diocese better than any of his predecessors after many years. He was a wonderful judge of character, and I found that he knew what sort of a man a given rector or vicar was better than I could tell him, and he never forgot the facts and history of each parish when he had once learnt them. So determined was he to know every parish that, on the occasion of his first visit to us, he expressed a desire to inspect Newtown Linford Church, which until lately had been a donative under the Earls of Stamford and consequently a sealed book to a bishop. I told him that no bishop had ever been known to go there, whereupon he asked me the way. I replied that, if he did not mind a bit of a scramble, I could take him a picturesque walk over rocks and fern through Bradgate Park. He at once jumped at the idea, and I need not say that he knew as much or more of the history of that interesting locality (where Lady Jane Grey pursued her studies under Roger Ascham) than I, who had lived in the neighbourhood all my life. But, to my horror, on arriving at the unclimbable hunting gate, by means of which I had hoped to effect our exit from the park, I discovered that my private key would not fit the lock. The granite wall and gates are about ten feet high, and so constructed as to prevent the deer from escaping. I looked at them for a few minutes with anxious care, and though I felt I might manage to scramble up the wall myself, I could not see how the episcopal tights and orthodox gaiters could overcome the obstacle. The Bishop, however, declared he would go wherever I could, and so we managed it; it was a scene I shall never forget. Arrived at the church, for which we obtained the key with some difficulty, it was thoroughly inspected. But meanwhile the news that a bishop had appeared had passed through the village, and the delighted vicar coming up, warmly welcomed the first episcopal visit known at Newtown Linford. I need hardly say that a church restoration was the result, and further visits from the Bishop.'

Many were the similar rambles to inspect other churches. Wherever he stayed, the Bishop visited as many as possible of the neighbouring churches, and whenever he could take a day's holiday with his children or with some of the friends that stayed with him, it was spent in exploring some corner of the

diocese. The train would be taken to one village, and then we walked across country to return from some other station. Sandwiches provided our lunch, and sometimes the whole party invaded a hospitable vicarage for tea, or, if this was not possible, resorted to some roadside inn. In every parish the vicar was visited, and the church was inspected. The Bishop was always much vexed when he found a church locked, and the keys had to be hunted for. He spoke on this subject in his 'Primary Charge':

'I am very strongly of opinion that every church should be open and accessible to all at all times of every day. I know all that can be said against this suggestion. I know that people rarely use the church when it is open. Can it be expected that the habit will grow up at once? I know all that can be said about inconveniences and dangers of loss or of irreverence. . . . But I do not think that there is any real danger to be apprehended—and I speak with some knowledge. For many years past I have been in the habit of examining parish churches in various parts of England. I have gained considerable knowledge of the way in which they are cared for and used. In my experience I should say roughly, that about half the parish churches stand open, that those which stand open are much better cared for than those which do not; that they are as a rule more highly decorated . . . that I can discover no peculiarities of position or of local conditions which determine the matter, but apparently only the feeling of the clergyman.'¹

There seemed to be a special fitness in the fact that one with such a lively appreciation of architecture should be called to rule a diocese containing such rare treasures as the churches in the valley of the Nene. The beauty and interest of the churches he visited in the course of his ministration were an unfailing delight and refreshment to the Bishop, and he ever sought to impress upon clergy and people the preciousness of their parish church.

'These fabrics [he said] are messengers of spiritual truth, perpetually set before the eyes of men. . . . Men are always proud of their parish church, and are willing to make sacrifices for its sake. This feeling should be carefully cherished as a basis for further teaching. The clergyman is the official guardian of the fabric of the church; and its surroundings

¹ *The Church and the Nation*, p. 112.

within and without depend upon his carefulness. The surroundings of the church are as important as the structure itself. A trim garden looks ill beside an ill-kept churchyard. I am glad to think that there are no remaining instances of a comfortable parsonage beside a dilapidated church.'¹

Though constantly called upon to preach at the reopening of churches after restoration, his sermons were always varied and living. He wished to make the people feel the meaning of their church :

'Our villages are but a collection of houses gathering round their church. The great memorial of every place is its church. What is it that makes a village? It is the beauty, the dignity, the appealing splendour of the House of God round which it gathers, and which seems to protect it and keep it under its care. The parish churches of England are the greatest and most noble memorials of the past. . . . This church tells a tale of long antiquity ; it tells how the village grew and prospered . . . how those who had received blessings from God returned to Him some portion of their substance in beautifying and adorning it.'²

And again :

'To-day you take possession of this restored church . . . the ancient fabric is closely connected with all that is most intimate in your lives in the past. You have come here when your lives were full of joy, and you have come also when they were full of sorrow. . . . The village church tells us what God has done for our race in days of old. Though many of its ornaments are gone, we can make the glory of the latter house greater by offering in it a more spiritual worship.'³

'We do not decorate our churches to please God, but to make them fitting memorials of our personal relation with God, a worthy memorial of His presence among men.'

'Churches are beautiful that they may wean those who worship in them from the thought of the common things of daily life.'

He was anxious that in building new churches men should not fall too far behind the traditions of their fathers :

'This shire is rich in its noble churches . . . bringing

¹ *The Church and the Nation*, p. III.

² Sermon at the reopening of Bugbrooke Church after restoration. May 6, 1891.

³ At the reopening of Rearsby Church after restoration. January 21, 1892.

home to us the tale of self-sacrifice made in the past for the service of the Lord. Its memories are imperative, we cannot fall below the example which our forefathers set us; our mighty churches are the boast of our shire. They are the outward symbol of the cry, "Come and see what the Lord hath done for my soul."¹

He was always ready to enter into any scheme of restoration and to give his advice and care that it might be done in such a way as to preserve and not transform a building. On his first visit to Irthlingborough (July 4, 1891) the noble tower was lying in ruins; he preached on hope, bidding his congregation remember all they had inherited from the past, and determine to hand it on unimpaired. He urged them to set to work at once to build up the tower so that it might be ready at the next dedication festival. Two years later he was summoned to re-dedicate the magnificent lantern tower, standing separate from the church, which is one of the most striking features of the Nene valley. It had been rebuilt with pious care of the old stones; a tower, as the Bishop told the people, 'unique in England, to them a symbol of God's protection, following them into every detail of their daily life.'

One church he saved after it had been condemned as unsafe by the architects, and its destruction ordered that a new one might be built. He urged that the matter should be reconsidered, with the result that it was found possible to strengthen and maintain the old fabric. The care with which he entered into the details of schemes for church restoration is shown by the following letters:

To the Rev. S. Short

' March 2, 1892.

'Thank you for Mr. Townsend's report, which is very good. There is only one point on which I doubt, though he puts it doubtfully. It is the expediency of removing the plaster inside the church and exposing the masonry. The building does not seem to be such that the masonry will stand exposure. It was plastered from the first and had better remain so.

'Mr. Fitzwilliam's offer almost prescribes the order of procedure. He will not begin till you are ready to do

¹ Sermon on laying the foundation stone of the new aisle of St. Edmund's, Northampton, June 8, 1891.

something. In fact, it would be much cheaper to make one job of the structural part of the work. This would be :

- (1) Repair of transept by Mr. Fitzwilliam.
Pointing of all walls.
Repair of west wall of N. aisle.
New East window.
- (?) New window in east of N. aisle.
Thorough repair of drains and gutters.
- (2) New floor : seats : renewing whitewash inside.
- (3) Repair of roof.

'I should say that 400*l.* should see you through (1) rather less than more.'

This refers to the interesting old church of Northborough, a lonely village about four miles from Peterborough. Mr. Short says : 'The Bishop was the largest of all the subscribers to the general restoration of the church, contributing practically nearly 100*l.* to the work, which could never have been carried out without his munificence.'

To the Rev. L. Leney

'August 5, 1895.

'Let me give you my suggestions as you ask for them.

'(1) I assume that you have a Committee—the Churchwardens and one or two business men. Take them into counsel about details.

'(2) Your work is purely *structural* restoration, is it not? This makes a great deal of difference about the architect. If it is a question of restoring mouldings—i.e. of discovering what they probably were, and deciding how they ought to be treated, then the art of the architect comes in : otherwise it is his capacity as a supervisor of building which you need. On this point depends your decision whether you ask a man like Pearson.

'(3) Your idea of having a report, and then acting upon it locally—i.e. leaving the application of its details to a local builder—is rather difficult to carry out. In restoring a tower it is a question of *individual stones*. Shall this one be replaced by a new one? Shall it be re-faced? or shall it be mended by cement? You can scarcely leave this to a clerk of the works. I doubt if an architect would give his name to an undertaking of this kind, for which he would be held responsible, while he was not really so.

'(4) I am in favour of the most conservative treatment of such a tower as yours.

This refers to the beautiful tower of the church at Hinckley.

The Bishop was able to see the general work of necessary church restoration in his diocese, which had been energetically begun in the time of his predecessor, almost completed during his episcopate. There was one notable exception, about which he was most anxious, the church of Fotheringhay, alike conspicuous for its architectural beauty, and rich in its historical associations. He considered that it held the rank of an historical monument, and that as the fabric was reported to be in a dangerous condition and the inhabitants of the little village could not undertake so large a work themselves, the help of the outside public might well be asked.

It was of course a work of years to get to know the 676 parishes in his diocese, and some at least the Bishop was unable to visit during his short episcopate. But he soon made himself felt throughout the diocese. During the months of June and July he was almost constantly away from home, preaching, confirming, reopening churches, giving away prizes at boys' and girls' schools, everywhere gathering knowledge about men and places.

At Peterborough there were gatherings of Rural Deans and Mission clergy, garden parties, meetings at the Palace for different societies, constant interviews with clergy, visits from curates to be licensed, friends old and new to be entertained. Amongst others a large party of Newnham and Girton students visited us, and he showed them the glories of the Cathedral.

By the end of the summer he was quite ready for a holiday, and on September 22 we started for Sicily. We spent a fortnight visiting Palermo, Cefalù, Girgenti, Catania, Syracuse, Taormina, and Messina. He never enjoyed anything more than the two days we spent in rambling about the ruins of Grecian temples at Girgenti, and visiting the theatre and forts at Syracuse, he wondered whether Athens itself could give such an overpowering sense of the greatness of Greek life as did the solitary ruins of Girgenti. Taormina he considered the most beautiful place he had ever seen. On our way back we lingered at Naples and Verona and reached Peterborough again on October 23.

To Count Ugo Balzani

‘Roma : October 15, 1891.

‘Dear Balzani,—Your telegram, which was forwarded here from Messina, gave me a new pang and prompts me to write to you and say how sorry we are that our meeting has failed. . . . I am afraid that our tour has had too much travelling in it for the short time at our disposal, and for a week in Sicily we endured a scirocco. We arrived at Naples very limp, and stayed there to recover, in which we partially succeeded. But at Messina there was no spirit left in us, and the thought of the journey home was awful to our minds. . . . As we do not want to reach home tired out, we are travelling on with carefully regulated journeys, so as to secure a night’s rest. . . . The purpose still stands to come to Ivrea some summer, though we hope soon to see you in England again. There is a charm of novelty about us ; you never find us twice in the same place. Cambridge and Worcester are things of the past, and I cannot say that Peterborough as a place has the charm of either.

‘But I wanted to tell you something of my impressions of Italy. It is now eight years since I visited it, and I am surprised at the advance which has been made. Sicily I never saw before ; but it is obviously flourishing, quite orderly, and the people industrious, serious, economical, not given to pleasure. There are scarcely any caffès in Sicily : the “Salone” takes their place : men sit and talk, and that suffices them. A door to sit at and a chair to sit on is enough to make a Sicilian happy. But Naples surprised me immensely ; it is thirteen years since I was there. Now I was not begged of, nor was my pocket picked ; cleanliness has grown vastly : the town has enormously increased, there is much more industry : the loafers are swept away. I had a *vetturino* who perfectly surprised me by his knowledge of history and geography. He knew all about European countries, their towns, their reigning families, their politics. He even talked to me about Cromwell, Ferdinand the Catholic, and Don Carlos. He knew about Lord Salisbury and W. H. Smith. I wondered if any London cabman knew the name of the Italian prime minister : but then doubtless he has not many Italian tourists to drive about. However, so far as the cursory glance of a traveller can discern anything, Italy is growing steadily in the industry, and therefore in the real wealth, of her people.

‘Another thing that has struck me is the way which the Germans have taken to travel : many for pleasure : very many as commercial travellers. They are willing to pursue small

gains even in out-of-the-way places. But one story which I heard from an Italian commercial traveller seemed to me very remarkable. The man was a general representative of foreign houses in the clothing trade: he sold Scotch tweeds and Lyons silks. He told me he had sent an order for silk from Palermo, which the Lyons house refused to execute, because the silks were to be worn at the commemoration of the "Vespro Siciliano," which they regarded as an affront to France. The traveller told me of his amazement at this answer: how he wrote that he never mixed politics and commerce, and had no idea when the silk was to be worn. The French house was firm, and he ceased to act for it. Well, I will not continue my vain and frivolous jottings. I have seen many things and learned much. I never saw anything so Greek as Girgenti, or more full of the past of Greece than Syracuse, and I revelled in the Norman works at Palermo and Monreale. The only regret attaching to my mind is that we have missed you, which you must please forgive.'

To the Rev. C. A. Potter

'Upper House of Convocation: April 28, 1891.

'Dear Potter,—Your letter reached me on the morning of my Consecration. It recalled many old memories, and led me to wonder why you had so long lapsed into silence—life, as you say, has lately gone rapidly with me; but, as I look back, I see that the happiest time was that which I spent in a country parish. . . . I sit among seven children, all of whom prosper in their way. One feels old when confronted with tall daughters and boys at school.

'I am sitting listening to discussions in which I take a languid interest. I am trying to learn something of my new duties; there is plenty to learn and plenty to do. At present I have no roof over my head, but hope to settle at Peterborough in about a fortnight. . . .'

To Mr. Howard Pease

'Cole Orton Rectory: July 8, 1891.

'Dear Howard,—I was delighted to get your letter and to read your articles. I thought your story was very good; it had an unexpected incident and a good deal of humour and quaintness of conception. Therefore I say go on and prosper.

'I quite think that novels are the form of literature which is most adapted to carry ideas into the popular mind at the present day. And the question of the literary form of novels is one which at present affords great scope for ingenuity. Old forms have been used up, new forms are exhausted with bewildering rapidity. Probably two forms are the most

promising: (1) the form which deals with manners and customs, local, provincial or social; (2) the historical novel.

‘If I were to develop my views on the last further, I should say that the historical novel lent itself to three modes of treatment: (*a*) the romantic—used up by Scott and Dumas, and their followers; (*β*) the patriotic—never used in England, but well known in Spain and Italy: rather difficult of application to English life; (*γ*) the psychological or philosophical, which affords an opportunity of developing character with a distinctness which a modern setting does not allow. We know the complexity of life at present; we resent the attempt to isolate or emphasise one side of it. The modern French novel is perfectly ridiculous, because it makes a man be in love with a woman for years, tells you nothing of his or her life or character, except what concerns that relationship. This is absurd, unnatural and fatuous. We are conscious of the puppets and can see the strings. There is really no merit in such books.

‘There I have rambled on enough to tell you my general views; the diversions of a hard-worked bishop who is always wandering about.’

To a Cambridge pupil

‘Peterborough: September 10, 1891.

‘Your question is an important one, and has to be considered with a view to general principles. The first point to make perfectly clear is what you *want* to do. Now I am of opinion that a continuous career at Cambridge is not the best thing for a man. . . . Reflect that Cambridge can give you at best a lectureship with or without a terminable fellowship—and that its temptations are to easy indolence or absorption in University business. You might or might not like India for a permanence. But even a few years there would teach you much, both in expanding your sphere of knowledge of history and of men and things. It would make you more valuable to Cambridge if at any time you wished to return, or it would fit you for other work in England. I think that a man succeeds by the energy which he has within him, more than by a careful adjustment of external circumstances.

‘It is a question of a venture. If you feel within you the force to make a venture for *the good of your own mind* rather than with a view to any definite career, do so. If you feel that you are better suited to pursue a cautious course towards the fleshpots of Cambridge, do so.

‘But get the issue quite straight. If you go—go, because you wish to learn, and you gladly take the chance of extending

your experience. Go without any attempt to forecast or adjust the future. Go saying, "I want to become a wiser and a larger man; if I become so, there will be more and better work for me to do, somewhere, somehow; and bread and water will not be wanting."

'Again, if you go, *go at once*; throw over your engagements which are not binding, and put yourself in the hands of the authorities to go when they want you. Never dally over a career which you are leaving; get to your new work at once. No habit is more to be encouraged than that of plunging into what you undertake.

'These are the heads of my advice. You can judge if you look within; you vacillate if you look without.'

To Miss Alice Gardner

'Peterborough, October 27, 1891.

'Dear Miss Gardner,—I so much value my connexion with Newnham College that I should submit myself to your pleasure in the matter of serving on the Council. But I do not know that I would be very acceptable—however, that is a point which you can probably discover. Also I do not know that I can promise absolute regularity of attendance; but I will come as often as I can if I get long enough notice.

'I often think of Cambridge with regret. In fact, on coming back from a holiday in Sicily it seemed more natural to take the train at King's Cross for Cambridge than for Peterborough, which has hardly begun to feel like home.'

CHAPTER II

EPISCOPAL ADMINISTRATION

IN the Diocese of Peterborough there are many small country parishes, red-brick villages lying amongst the pastures of Leicestershire, clusters of grey or brown stone houses round a mighty church in Northamptonshire, besides many quiet little country towns such as Towcester, Oundle, or Oakham, and growing manufacturing places like Wellingborough and Hinckley. The shoe industry, which, owing to the introduction and perfection of the new machines, was, when Creighton became bishop, rapidly becoming exclusively a factory instead of a home industry, went on constantly extending into new districts. A big factory would be planted in a quiet country village, and the vicar, accustomed to the care of a few hundred agricultural labourers, saw his parish invaded by crowds of shoe-hands. The question of church extension was always a pressing one, especially in Leicester, which had grown so rapidly as to outstrip the efforts made by all the various religious organisations to keep pace with it. Bishop Magee had founded a Church Extension Society both for Leicester and Northampton, and in his episcopate of twenty-two years, one hundred thousand pounds was spent on church building. The churches planned under his supervision were for the most part completed, but the need had gone on growing with ever-increasing rapidity. Dr. Creighton spoke for the first time at a Church Extension meeting in Leicester, in November 1891. He appealed to the Christian patriotism of his audience to see that those who were drawn in from the surrounding country to the busy industrial life of Leicester should have provision made for their souls' health.

‘Industrial civilisation is at first only busied with filling men's pockets ; thought and care for their higher interests limp

like laggards behind the eager pursuit of material benefits. The towns, as their streets grow, tell of the activity of the municipal body, of the care of the sanitary inspectors. But it is left to the quickened conscience of the community at large to do what is needed to maintain the high spiritual interests without which external things are vain and empty. . . . The dwellers in towns are robbed of the beauties of the country, but they have some compensations. They have the advantage of a quickened intellectual life—they ask questions which are not asked by the dwellers in the country—their spiritual nature is not dead ; on the contrary, it is very inquisitive. . . . It is useless to multiply wealth, to build houses and streets, unless the people who live in them have some high and noble ideal of life.'

He asked for 5,800*l.* to meet the most pressing needs, and was much gratified when a gift of 1,000*l.* from one donor was announced during the meeting.

A few days later he spoke on the same subject at Northampton, and said that much social failure had taught us that we had neglected in the past to make sure that 'imperishable basis upon which a nation's greatness must ultimately depend.' 'Progress goes hand in hand with Christianity. The central idea of Christianity is that of unlimited progress—progress and liberty.' He concluded by pointing out that a time had been reached when the Church, in towns, must depend very largely upon the voluntary help of its people, who must help it as their ancestors had done.

Year after year these appeals had to be made. As he learnt to know the special conditions better, the Bishop made his appeal more direct. He showed how a link was needed between employers and men under the altered conditions of living, since the employers by living away from their men had incurred a new obligation ; they must learn to look upon the clergy as their agents. He pointed out how the great churches built by their ancestors in Leicester still remained, whilst the castle and the monastery had perished, a sign that it was the spiritual life of the people that must be the mainspring of the national existence. It was his opinion that the clergyman should be paid for by the people amongst whom he ministered, but that the church should be built by the munificence of the employers ; but he wished subscription

lists to be more democratised, and that each person, however poor, should feel the call to give what he could.

On all occasions he insisted that the new churches must be an ornament to the city. He was especially interested in the plans for the church of St. James to be built on a commanding site in Leicester, opposite the Victoria Park. He suggested that it should follow the design of a basilica; the architect, Mr. Goddard, a Leicester man, and a personal friend, warmly fell in with his views. There was considerable opposition on the building committee, but the plan was carried through, and a church built, which has won much admiration, but which the Bishop was destined never to see.¹

It seemed to him most urgent that he should learn to understand so important a part of his diocese as the city of Leicester, and that its people should get to know him. So he decided to reside there for some weeks in each year. He and I settled ourselves in lodgings in Leicester towards the end of October 1891, for about three weeks. The days were spent in incessant work, meetings followed one another in quick succession, clergy were interviewed, institutions visited, and many sermons preached. One of the Sundays is described in the following letter to my daughter :

‘ November 2, 1891.

‘ We had a tremendous day yesterday. First we went to an eight o'clock celebration in Mr. Robinson's church, where father celebrated, and then we went to breakfast with him. . . . After breakfast father and I drove off to another church in the outskirts of Leicester, where he preached, and after service we lunched with the vicar, quite a young man, living in lodgings, and the curate. After lunch we drove to another church in Leicester, the great Evangelical church, where father instituted a new vicar and gave a little address. . . . After that we drove back here to tea and then soon we went off again to a great ritualistic church where father was to preach. I got there about a quarter of an hour before service, but it was crammed, and I got about the last seat. There were chairs all up the aisles and people stood all through the service, and some hundreds were turned away. After that the day's work was over, and we came back here to a quiet and frugal meal.’

From Leicester he went to assist at a general Mission

¹ See letters on p. 466.

in Northampton. He had commended the Mission to the people of Northampton in the following letter :

‘ Dearly beloved in the Lord,—You are aware that the clergy of Northampton, acting on a strong feeling of their duties as teachers of the Christian faith, have decided to hold a Mission in all churches of the town, for the days beginning on November 14 next. The object of this special effort is to provide courses of continuous teaching, suited to all classes and to all ages, of the great truths which concern the spiritual life of the soul. All knowledge demands attention : and the business of daily life makes us forgetful, or heedless, of the higher part of our nature. It is well for all of us to have put before us, from time to time, the large issues of our lives as God’s children. We all need greater knowledge of God and of ourselves. We should be ready to use the opportunities afforded us of increasing this knowledge. I therefore affectionately admonish you not to reject the instruction which will be put before you, but prayerfully to seek for an understanding heart and a humble spirit, that you may profit to your soul’s health. There is much to be learned, and each opportunity of learning brings with it a new responsibility.’

The Bishop opened the Mission by an address in All Saints church to the Mission workers. He remained in the town throughout the Mission, attending and helping in many services, everywhere encouraging the clergy by his presence and sympathy. He addressed railway men at their dinner hour, preached to the inmates of the workhouse, and on the last Saturday evening spoke to some three thousand working-men in the Corn Exchange. He was always at his best in addressing such a meeting. His manly, direct manner appealed to the men at once, his crisp and pointed sentences rivetted their attention, and his ready humour gained their sympathy. In this speech he told them that the real enemy of religion in these days, as it had always been, was indifference, the old complaint of the world ; men who tried to do good had had to face it at all times.

‘ If we go back to the time of the Greeks, and ask what to the Greek mind was the greatest sin, we find that it was insolence. To them insolence meant the failure of a man to realise what was his true attitude to life, to understand that he was bound, if he would be a true man, to face life boldly and fearlessly with all its issues, to think through its problems,

to recognise the limits under which his life had to be lived. Still the same thing is needed. We still ask you to look at your life straight, to see what it means, to see what are the things that will destroy it. And we are forced to conclude with the old Greeks that it is insolence which destroys a man's life. . . . What the Greeks called insolence, we call irreverence; and irreverence is at the bottom of indifference. It means the want of respect for anything but a man's own desires, the want of self-sacrifice, of self-restraint, the want of manliness, the want of a desire to think things out, to face life and its issues broadly and courageously. . . . I have been struck during this Mission with the reverence shown by the crowds in the churches, but I could not help also being struck by the irreverence shown by the crowds in the streets. You will ask what I mean by this. I will tell you what are the signs of the irreverent spirit. We meet a band of young men walking down the street, filling the pavement, singing and shouting at the top of their voices, jostling against the other passengers. They would tell you that they were merely enjoying themselves. But what is the spirit they are showing? It is that spirit of irreverence which means self-assertion, which makes them behave as if the world belonged to them and them only, without any thought of others. Indifference to religion springs from just the same source as that irreverence. . . . Irreverence is destructive to society of every kind. Human life cannot rest upon a basis of self-assertion. Progress, civilisation, human life, all rest upon the assumption that every man in the exercise of his own rights shall respect the rights of others. . . . In the present day there is an idea that every man can settle everything for himself and by himself. We glory in our constantly increasing freedom, especially in freedom in the expression of opinion, and it is the highest form of freedom that every man should speak out the truth that is in him and should suffer others to do the same. It is right that everyone should exercise this freedom, but a man should not speak without a due sense of the responsibility of speaking. His words must not be mere echoes of other men's words, but must come from the fulness of his own heart. If a man claims to be free to express his opinion, it should be an opinion that is his own because he has thought it out for himself. Freedom does not mean the throwing overboard all authority and the growth of self-assertion.'

He then delighted his audience by telling them the story of a Chartist who talked over with a shoemaker the Chartist programme, and said that he agreed with most of it, but did

not think yearly Parliaments quite long enough, as a man could not learn his business in that time. Upon this the shoemaker rose and said, 'If I were sent to Parliament, do you think there is any question upon which I should not be fit to pronounce an opinion after a night's thought?'

His presence during the Mission helped to make the Bishop well known in Northampton. He formed a real friendship with Canon Hull,¹ vicar of All Saints, the leading clergyman in the city. When he went to Northampton he constantly stayed with Canon Hull, and his knowledge of the place helped the Bishop to enter fully into all its needs.

The visits to Leicester were repeated every subsequent autumn, and the consecutive weeks spent there, together with frequent short visits at other times, enabled the Bishop to get a real hold upon the city. He did not limit his attentions to any one class, but tried to make all alike feel that he wished them to come to him for any help which he could give. During the days of incessant work whilst he lived in his Leicester lodging, his only recreation was a visit to a merry family of boys in a poor vicarage. Bishop and boys alike enjoyed the wild romps which then took place, and he would come out from them exhausted but refreshed. He did not forget his little friends when he was away from them, and wrote to their father :

' December 19, 1892.

'Will you do me the kindness of taking charge of the enclosed and expending it in Christmas presents for your children? It is not fair to throw on you this labour, but I feel that perhaps you could do it more efficiently than I could myself.'

During his third stay in Leicester, the Bishop asked the clergy to arrange conferences for him with the various classes of persons connected with the Church: Sunday and day school teachers, churchwardens, sidesmen, choirmen, district visitors, and the clergy themselves. About the arrangements for these conferences, he wrote to the Rev. H. S. Gedge :

¹ Canon Hull died after a long illness some months before the Bishop, and unfortunately destroyed before his death the letters which he had received from him.

‘October 13, 1893.

‘The numbers that you quote are rather appalling, but you may reckon on many absentees, and I think all might be asked except Sunday school teachers : I think in their case representatives might suffice.

‘I wish it to be known as widely as possible that what I want is not to *address* them, but to confer with them, and I want them to talk with me. . . .’

The district visitors were a little alarmed at the high ideal of their work which he held up before them. But the opportunity of talking over their difficulties with their Bishop was much appreciated by all workers.

To the Rev. Canon Stocks

‘Craven House, Leicester : November 4, 1893.

‘Dear Stocks,—The churchwardens attended in their thousands and went on till ten o’clock. I send you a few notes.

‘(1) Inventories of Church goods apparently non-existent. It would be well if the clergy entered their present possessions in the Vestry Book, and introduced the custom that the outgoing churchwarden should hand them over to the incoming churchwarden, who should sign his name as a receipt—appending any necessary remark.

‘(2) The parish which disposes of its alms in the right way is St. George’s. There is a relief committee to which clergy and district visitors alike *recommend*.

‘(3) The alms expended on the poor ought to be accounted for at the annual vestry, and with the statement should be a book containing names and dates to tally.

‘(4) Too great pains cannot be taken to make everything connected with the Church monies and possessions absolutely *businesslike*. Only so will business men give their money. They clearly showed that unbusinesslike ways in the past strongly influenced them now.

‘(5) About church-going they had much to say, but it was very like what the clergy say. I give you some suggestions. For morning services,

‘(a) Shorter, with shorter sermons : ten to fifteen minutes, plain and practical.

‘(β) Less elaborate music, more congregational singing.

‘(γ) Decided irritation against curates who read lessons unintelligibly and gabble prayers. Clearly the reading of lessons is of great importance.

‘(δ) More visiting of *men* : more downrightness in asking

them to go to church : more display of personal interest in them by the clergy.

‘ There was a feeling that the *men* were rather neglected.

‘ (ε) Sunday morning walks ; but a working-man denied the necessity of this, as Saturday was a half-holiday ; and the men were all up long before eleven.

‘ (ζ) Clubs open on Sunday at service-time.

‘ (η) No organisation for looking up absentees. A suggestion that each congregation should have two or three *Visitors*, who looked up those who were by way of coming to church, when they began to drop off. One man said : “ The clergy are not businesslike : we business men have to look after our customers, and the clergy should do the same.” Said that, though sidesman and twenty years in parish, he had not been visited six times, and at present the two curates had never called on him at all—I forbore to ask his parish.

‘ (θ) Working-men, not brought up as Churchmen, find dissenting service easier to understand. This is absolutely true. Men need training to the Church Service. Sunday schools, catechising, children’s services, should keep this clearly in view. Mission services also.

‘ (ι) There were complaints about sermons being *about nothing*. Young curates lose themselves in elaborate doctrinal expositions which clear up nothing. They use too long words. Greater simplicity and sense needed in sermons.’

To the same

‘ Peterborough : November 25, 1893.

‘ Dear Stocks,—. . . You may make any use you think fit of my letter. I think that more attention to the practical side of visiting would be well. It might be possible for the Church to do more to show itself the friend of the people, working for their physical and social welfare, but working wisely and seeking for the best way of helping. This cannot be done without some knowledge of principles. I can only suggest that some addresses be given to clergy and district visitors by competent persons.

‘ The hindrance to churchgoing is indifference : and this comes because men do not see the good of it. Only zeal for their welfare in *some way that they can understand* will attract them. This is the point of attachment between their conscience and the Gospel which is at present revealed to us. All social movements however futile are our opportunities : we should sympathise with what is true in them.

‘ There is one perhaps trivial point which I think important. It came prominently before me in a remark of one of the

choirmen, that they would go into church happier if the clergy said good day and shook hands with them in the vestry. This was a far-reaching remark. The spirit of Christ differs from the spirit of the world, not so much in its superior activity or capacity, as in its *different temper*. In a busy place like Leicester the clergy have much business and much organisation. But they should not do it in the same way as worldly business is done. Somehow we should feel and show that we meet as Christian brethren, not as men of business. We ought to bring kindness, geniality, courtesy, personal friendliness to all that we do. I think that all our meetings in Leicester could be improved greatly in that way. If the clergy will think it over they will see great force in the choirman's remark. Do they know his family circumstances? do they ever enquire? Are they his friends? or are they like his employer during the week? Christian influence is the influence of a life, and a life must speak to another life, not in the abstract way only, but beginning from particulars.'

The Bishop was very particular about the services for all kinds of special occasions. He examined the forms used elsewhere for Consecration, Dedication and other services, and adapted those which best satisfied him for use in his diocese. He hated any muddle or sense of fuss, but objected equally to unpunctuality, unnecessary pauses and long-drawn-out services. He wished everything to be carefully thought out and arranged beforehand. His own promptness enabled him to get through functions quickly, without giving any sense of hurry. Whenever possible he liked to institute a new vicar himself, and by his presence and sympathy to encourage him in the beginning of his work. Curates were licensed by himself in his private chapel, and he always tried to have a talk with them about themselves, and about the special conditions of the parish to which they were going. One curate remembers his saying, 'Make a friend of your vicar, don't keep any of your difficulties from him. I know this is what he will wish.'

Love for children made him delight in his Confirmations. He tried to arrange that the service should not last more than an hour, so that the children might not be wearied; and he would never confirm more than two hundred at a time. Directions were issued by him to the clergy for the conduct of the service in which he went into the most minute detail, so as to secure that a continuous stream of candidates should

come up in an orderly manner. He gave two short addresses at every Confirmation, speaking to the children from his very heart, and trying always to give them something which they could carry away.

He wrote once : ' I have been away from home confirming. I always like that part of my work ; it is very nice going from one village church to another, in this lovely weather, and seeing all the young people, and trying to say something which they may remember.' And again : ' It is a great privilege of my office that I am brought into contact with many young lives in my Confirmations.'

His previous experience as examining chaplain helped him in making the arrangements for his Ordinations. He knew exactly what he wanted. The few days before the Ordination were meant to be days of serious preparation, yet not exactly like a retreat ; he wished them to give opportunities not only for teaching, prayer and meditation, but also for social intercourse between the candidates and their Bishop and his chaplains, as well as with one another. He changed Dr. Magee's arrangements by separating the examination from the Ordination. The candidates were not invited to stay at the Palace during their examination, because he did not like to enter into personal relations with men whom he might afterwards have to reject. He took great pains about the examinations with regard to the choice of subjects and other points, and was always ready to support his examiners, though he sometimes took a more lenient view than they did. His chief concern was with the character and general capacities of the men, and for these things he had, in the opinion of his chaplains, an almost unerring insight. At the time of the Ordination our children were sent away, as many candidates as possible were lodged in the Palace, and the rest were taken in by the Dean and Canons, but all spent the whole day at the Palace. He had at once secured the services of Canon Yates, one of Dr. Magee's examining chaplains.

To the Rev. Canon Yates

'February 23, 1891.

'Your experience of the past and your knowledge of the Diocese would furnish a link of continuity, which I should regret to see destroyed. . . . Your fellow-examiners will be

Bigg of Ch. Ch., now rector of Fenny Compton, whom perhaps you know, and who is quite the best examiner I have ever come across; and Arthur Lyttelton, the Master of Selwyn College.'

He was glad if all three chaplains could be present during the days preceding the Ordination, so that they might see as much of the men as possible. At meals he would not have them sit together or by himself or me, but liked them to distribute themselves amongst the candidates. The only relaxation allowed was when they took a walk with him in the afternoon, or met in his study to smoke and talk after ten o'clock in the evening.

Another clergyman was always invited to give addresses in the chapel, and also to preach the Ordination sermon. He considered it important that the men should not be troubled by any possible diversity of teaching, and that one man should have the opportunity of speaking his mind fully on such an important occasion. The last address in the chapel he gave himself, and then he allowed no one but the candidates to be present. No record of the words then uttered remains except in the lives of those to whom they were spoken. One of them writes :

'The abiding impression left on my mind of these addresses was a sense of the sacredness and dignity and awful responsibility of the Ministry which I had not been able to realise before. And his words had such a strange power because one felt them to be absolutely and transparently sincere. There was none of the pulpit manner, no rhetoric, no seeking after effect. You felt that this was not "an address," but that he was talking to you all alone by yourself, and dealing with your soul individually at the most solemn moment in your life. And that absence of the pulpit manner was, I think, the secret of the power of all his addresses that I ever heard. Other men, even the best, when they preach, are at a higher pitch, and in a different key, to what they are out of the pulpit. But he was always just himself. He never "preached," he just talked to you perfectly naturally; and the effect was greater than the finest oratory in the world.'

On the afternoons of the days before the Ordination the Bishop instituted conferences or meetings for discussion. The

subject was chosen by the candidates, and introduced by one of them who had prepared a short paper beforehand. The Bishop then called on each of the priests in turn to speak and finally on the chaplains. All considered it a rather formidable ordeal, but felt amply repaid by the Bishop's final summing up. Dr. Bigg says: 'He began in a tone of good-natured banter, tearing up any foolish things that had been uttered, then defined the terms, then laid down principles, then gave sound practical advice, and wound up in an exalted impressive strain.' Dr. A. T. Lyttelton writes:

'The Bishop summed up the discussion with great skill in gathering up the different opinions and in giving his own view so as to throw a wholly new light upon it. I recollect some of these summings up as really extraordinary instances of his combination of grasp, sympathy, and originality of mind.'

One of the candidates says:

'One felt that when he had spoken there was nothing else to be said; no one could have added anything more, for there was no more to be said. It gave one the impression of finality. I think this impression never lost its force. Whenever I heard him speak subsequently, whether in sermons or addresses at Confirmation, or in conversation, the same feeling was always present. One might perhaps not always agree with him in everything, but one always felt that there was a fulness in what he said which was entire and complete.'

Another candidate recalls how, at one of the conferences, he had objected to the practice of holding the Sunday school in the church as likely to diminish the reverence children should feel for the church. In his summing up, the Bishop said that he did not agree, but people needed to be taught that their parish church was their spiritual home, and not a sort of ornamental idol in stone.

Every detail of the Ordination service was ordered by the Bishop. The candidates were sent into the Cathedral on the Saturday afternoon so as to be instructed in the arrangements for the service, and shown exactly what they would have to do. He introduced the plan of having each candidate called upon loudly and clearly by name, by one of the chaplains, to come up for Ordination. During the singing of the 'Veni

Creator' the assisting clergy were made to group themselves standing round the Bishop, and thus visibly to invoke a blessing on the kneeling candidates. Each man to be ordained priest was bidden to bring his stole in his hand, which the Bishop himself put round his neck after Ordination.

Dr. A. T. Lyttelton writes : ' In rather a wide and varied experience of Ordinations, I have seen none more dignified and solemn than those at Peterborough.'

The candidates never forgot the days spent at the Palace. The Bishop in all his intercourse with them was extraordinarily free, genial, and communicative. He made them easily at home with him ; but at the same time they felt that he impressed himself more upon them than anyone who approached them authoritatively would have done.

His excellent memory for faces helped him much in his intercourse with them ; he always knew their names, their faces, and all about them. When those who had been ordained deacon the year before arrived to be ordained priest, he remembered each individually, and where they were working ; even when he met them unexpectedly, in different parts of the diocese, he would show that he knew all about them, and astonish them by his extraordinary memory and genuine sympathy.

' I look back,' writes one of the candidates, ' upon the three days spent in the Palace at Peterborough at the time of Ordination as the most interesting in my life, for the Bishop with his magnetic personality inspired us all with an intense admiration for him.' At meal times all crowded to get near his end of the table, and his talk fascinated them. ' It was so interesting,' says one, ' that we found it difficult to eat.' It was full of variety ; sometimes he told amusing anecdotes, or he would tell of his personal experiences, of people and countries that he had seen, speaking of Russian novels, or Francis of Assisi, or the beauties of Dalmatia. Another time he would startle them by some paradox about education, and draw them out to express their own opinions ; all with such a light touch and such good-natured humour, that he seemed as young as the youngest ; and yet, as one of them says, ' he was always so dignified that we went away stirred to the depths of our heart by the example of his

saintly character, and filled with love and admiration for him and everything that made him so great.' 'He never oppressed us with his dignity,' says another, 'and never made us feel uncomfortable. He met us on our ground, and looked at a subject from our point of view, and treated us so fairly. When we were beaten in argument, and of course we always were, we could not say to ourselves "if he had not been our Bishop, I could have said this or that."'

His talk was interspersed with many bits of practical advice. 'Never spend more than two minutes a day over the newspaper.' 'Don't try to do too much; if any of you overwork yourselves, don't come to me for sympathy.' When one man spoke of his difficulty in finding illustrative anecdotes for his sermons, and begged that someone would recommend him a book, the Bishop said he knew of exactly the book he wanted, the Bible, and proceeded to point out the interest of the Bible stories, and how they could be used to illustrate teaching on questions of the day. He was fond of puzzling cocksure people, and when a prim little man asked him what books he recommended for devotional reading the reply was: 'H'm, yes, I don't know what devotional reading is.' He would join little groups of men as they gathered in the Abbot's Hall and ask 'What are you talking about?' and mix in the talk as one of themselves. At one moment he was a boy among boys, the next he was the devout priest, then the dignified prelate, all quite naturally and just as circumstances demanded. But, with all his kindness, he left upon men the impression that he was a person of whom they would have been terribly afraid, if they had done anything to incur his censure.

A rule had been made by Dr. Magee which Dr. Creighton confirmed, that curates during their diaconate might only preach one sermon a month of their own composition. Two of the sermons had to be sent to the Bishop for his inspection. At his private interview with each candidate, he used to speak about these sermons, and he also wrote his criticisms on them: 'Good, but are there not too many subjects?' 'This is all wrong,' &c. One man remembers two lines of comment at the end of his sermon 'which have since been of value to me over and over again.' These interviews were looked for-

ward to with a good deal of dread, produced especially by anticipation of the Bishop's possible criticism on the sermons. But the dread soon disappeared in the presence of his kindly sympathy. 'He did not attempt,' writes one man, 'to pick our feeble productions to pieces, but he would point out to us mistakes of method and faults of construction. It seemed to me that the ideal of preaching which he aimed at was to reach the hearts of our people by plain direct statements of that which we ourselves sincerely believed.'

At one of these private interviews, a candidate was somewhat disconcerted because the Bishop, after looking at him for some time without speaking, asked him if he were engaged; he then went on to give him some sound advice about the social difficulties of the large town to which he was going. He was keenly alive to the dangers of a curate's life, and to the disadvantage of his allowing himself to get entangled in an early engagement. He said that he would like to make a rule that no curate in his diocese should be allowed to get engaged without first bringing the young lady to him for his approval; but if any did become engaged, he always showed a sympathetic interest.

On the Sunday afternoons after the Ordination the candidates were asked to bring any relations or friends who had come to Peterborough for the service to tea at the Palace to see the Bishop. He always urged the candidates to stay in the Diocese, saying: 'Don't leave your diocese; you will go where you are not known.'

'These days at the Palace [writes one of the men] had an enormous effect upon one's relationship to the Bishop. The impression which he left was a most marked one. We went away absolutely under the spell of his attractive personality. He left the impression of extraordinary kindness. I think the fascination which he exercised was almost unbounded. He had the power of making you feel that *you* were the one person he was interested in, and that he was anxious to see. He had the gift of never appearing bored. He never forgot us. The indelible impression left is one of great kindness, graciousness, and a charm of manner which it is hardly possible to overstate.'¹

¹ This account of the Peterborough Ordinations is drawn mainly from reminiscences sent me by the Bishop's chaplains and by the men he ordained.

The relations begun at the time of Ordination between the Bishop and his younger clergy continued during the years that followed. One of them writes :

‘I do not know how to analyse his influence on young men like myself, which turned admiration into enthusiastic devotion and absolute confidence. It was impossible to be afraid of him and impossible not to talk to him just as freely as if one was speaking to one’s own father. He must have had a marvellous power of sympathy. We young men always felt he was our Bishop, belonging to us especially. . . . The happiest evenings in our lives were those nights after some long function, when he used to sit with all of us round him,¹ and encourage us to attack one of those delightful paradoxes of his, and we talked without any sense of restraint, with all the free feeling of a college common room, without feeling conscious of any check imposed on us by his presence, and yet somehow, with all that delightful sense of perfect freedom and open confidence, we were taken to a higher level of thought.

‘It is useless for me to try to describe his method of influencing us. His method was himself. Just to be with him gave us all a new ideal and a new enthusiasm, beyond that personal devotion to him which made one ready to follow him anywhere and do anything he counselled.’

Patrons who made enquiries of the Bishop about suitable men for livings, were struck by his knowledge of the curates in his Diocese. He would do nothing which might weaken the personal tie with them.

To the Rev. Canon Stocks

‘Aug. 1, 1892.

‘I gave letters dimissory in one case, and was so impressed with the unsatisfactory nature of the proceeding that I have since then refused. I have all the responsibility and none of the means of assuring myself that I am right. I establish no bond between the young man and myself, and know little or nothing about him afterwards. I came to the conclusion that the temporary inconvenience to the incumbent was less serious than the weakening of diocesan unity.’

The following letters further illustrate the Bishop’s relations to the younger clergy :

¹ This was at Mr. Bernard Wilson’s house at Kettering, where his curates live with him.

To one who was thinking of foreign service

‘Peterborough : April 11, 1892.

‘I have been thinking much about you. I see that you consider that you ought to go to Assyria, and I incline to think you ought. Somebody must go; the call has come without your seeking it: there are no substantial reasons against it. Therefore I say, Go. Personally I should have liked to keep you, and I shall part from you with real sorrow: but I must not try to keep everybody in my diocese.

‘I can sympathise with your difficulties in leaving your vicar in a strait. But that is just one of the motives which ought not to weigh with you. No one would have thought that it ought to prevent you from accepting a good living in England: therefore it ought not to prevent you from going to Assyria. Further, it is a great danger to form a constructive judgment. The issue is simply Assyria or England. Times, seasons, conditions, circumstances, ought not to affect that. Further, if you decide to go, the sooner the better. You cannot have your heart in a work which you are soon to leave: life is too short to admit of transitionary states being prolonged. It would not be to the real interest of St. Mark’s that you should stay for a time with the intention of going at a convenient season. There never will be a convenient season: something is always in the way. . . . Tell me your final decision. God bless you.’

To the same ‘St. Edmund’s Vicarage, Northampton : April 21, 1892.

‘My advice certainly supposed that personal reasons were equal. But what you tell me entirely alters the case. (1) No one ought to commit himself to any work abroad, contrary to medical advice. In the army and civil service no one is eligible who cannot pass a medical examination. The same applies *in foro interno* to the clergy.

‘(2) You are not justified in sacrificing your sister.

‘Therefore I unsay my previous advice, which was given on points of principle, not on questions of fact.

‘But I *do* say,

‘(1) Your mind ought to be made up quickly.

‘(2) It ought to be made up decidedly, without any reserve about future possibilities. Never keep vague plans before you. Decide as well as you can and then dismiss the matter.

‘Get the facts before you and decide, and then forget all about it.’

To one who was going to Australia

‘Peterborough: February 4, 1896.

‘I have just seen Mr.—— and have discussed with him the condition of the parish. He has told me of your willingness to stay with him for a time in his present anxiety. I cannot recommend you to do so to the abandonment of your previous project. Frankly, in this matter I am thinking much of yourself, and what is good for you. First, there is danger in abandoning a decision for private considerations. Secondly, I think that you would benefit in health by a sojourn in a good climate; and that you would benefit by the new experience which you would there gain. Lastly, I think that the mere fact that your relations with your vicar have been so intimate is a proof that a variety of experience would be beneficial.

‘You will understand that in saying this I am considering you, perhaps unduly. But I think I may venture to give you my advice as freely and fully as the facts occur to my own mind.’

To another

‘October 15, 1895.

‘I am very sorry that you think of leaving your work at ——. But I feel that the claims of the Colonial Church are so pressing that I ought not to be selfish. If you offer yourself for work in Brisbane, I should certainly consider that it did not break your connexion with this diocese, and I should welcome you at any time on your return.’

To the Rev. Canon Watson

‘November 19, 1896.

‘There is a point on which I should like you to act in the new calendar. I have undertaken to regard some clergy who have gone abroad as still connected with the diocese. The subject of foreign service is now before the Bishops generally: and a proposal, which doubtless will be accepted, is that such clergy be printed in the Diocesan Calendar for their diocese in a list headed *On Foreign Service*. I should like to leave such a record for my successor. He may remove it if he thinks fit.’

To one who had been offered a living in another diocese

‘February 14, 1893.

‘It is natural that L—— should have greater attractions than E——, and I have nothing to urge why you should not follow your own desires. But there is this to be said: that if you leave the diocese you begin your career afresh. I do

not know what you would ultimately like to settle down to : but you could tell me your wishes at any time : you will not have a similar opportunity elsewhere.

‘I only wish you to look ahead before you decide. I do not wish to lay upon you any obligation to E——. I am thankful for what you have done there : but I cannot ask you to go on as a matter of duty. I wish to leave you entirely free. May God direct you according to His good Providence.’

To the same

‘October 23, 1895.

‘I am going to ask you to succeed ——. I was reading the other day a letter of Bishop Grosseteste appointing an archdeacon. He said that if he could have found a man more suitable, he would not have appointed him to the post. I can say the same to you. I know the difficulties which must naturally exist, but you are better able to overcome them and make a new start than anyone else. . . . You have taken one hard post at my request. I feel an added responsibility in asking you to take another. God be with you and direct you.’

To the Rev. Alan Williams

‘The Palace, Peterborough : September 24, 1896.

‘My dear Mr. Williams,—I am very glad that you have been called to such a useful and interesting work as the care of seamen in South Africa. It is a work in which you will certainly learn much, and I trust will do much. It demands the difficult qualities of entire simplicity and entire straightforwardness. It is easier to be complicated than to be simple, it is easier to be an ecclesiastical partisan than a straightforward Christian. You will have to fall back upon your inmost self. Forms are of use to us that they may train us into a strength of character which we can display under any circumstances, and can adapt to any forms which may be most useful to others.

‘This I think is the secret of all mission work—readiness to approach others from the side from which they can be most easily approached,—not only from the side on which we ourselves have learned. May God bless and prosper you.’

It was not only the younger clergy who were stimulated by the Bishop. One of his Rural Deans writes :

‘He took the keenest interest in all his clergy, and was always prompt and thorough in dealing with any question great or small which they put before him. He expected

them to be as thoroughly interested in their parishioners as he was in them, and this in a broad sense. He wished them to be ready to make use of all opportunities of healthy intercourse with people of all classes and all creeds or no creeds. At the same time he gave great encouragement to their specially spiritual work, whatever form it might take. He was very urgent with them as to the importance of promptness and care in all matters of business, and impressed upon them the importance of seeing what was the principle involved in any particular piece of business, so as to avoid worrying about details. Those who were called upon in some degree to share his responsibility by holding some subordinate office felt in an increased degree the same sense of a kindly and yet penetrating influence, impressing upon them the need of prompt decision and action and the avoidance of mere formality and conventionality. He gave his confidence generously, and he expected a man serving under him to use his own judgment and act accordingly. He was quite frank and candid both in judgment and advice, and was a thorough friend to all who worked with him, so that he called out a spirit of real loyalty quite consistent with occasional honest differences of opinion.'

He met his clergy as an equal, and never wished to impose his views upon them :

To the Rev. Canon Watson

' July 1, 1894.

' I thought that our meeting was very useful. I think that the fact of its informality contributed to that result. It is most useful for me to know what people think, and what objects are most worth pressing. I have no hope of succeeding in anything in which I cannot count on the hearty co-operation of the Rural Deans, not only hearty, but convinced.'

To the Rev. Canon Stocks (in answer to some objections to his Confirmation arrangements)

' October 20, 1894.

' I am never wedded to my own ideas, but I will not change from respect to mere conservatism. I will discuss the point with you.'

' October 4, 1895.

' I am not an obstinate person. I do not want to have my own way even when I am sure that it is right. You shall have the nine parochial centres and I will solace myself with

thinking that if I set an example of obedience against my own judgment, it may be followed in turn.'

But he never hesitated to speak his opinion plainly, even when he did not wish to enforce it. When a certain diocesan board procured the resignation of an official against his desire he wrote :

'You must discuss the position fully, and if your board thinks fit you must pass a resolution asking me to terminate his tenure of office, and then we must proceed to elect a much worse man, who will do what the clergy tell him. . . . I can only stand outside and do what I am told, which is the function of a Bishop in his own diocese.'

He wished to be a real friend to his clergy, and recognised with glad generosity the help they gave him :

To the Rev. E. Grose Hodge 'Peterborough : February, 5, 1894.

'I shall part with you with very great regret ; and it cost me much to counsel you to go : but I thought that you ought not to refuse. We are only secure when we commit ourselves unreservedly to God's will and accept responsibilities which are not of our own seeking. Your loss is to me a serious one both personally and officially. I owe much to your constant kindness and unfailing loyalty. Your support made my work in Leicester comparatively easy, and I shall always remember that it was at your house that I first made the acquaintance of many whose co-operation has been most valuable. . . . I hope that our personal friendship will remain unbroken.'

To the Rev. A. O. James

'July 12, 1894.

'Your letter causes me great regret. I know the difficulties that beset your parish, but I trusted that you had overcome the worst of them. I remember talking once with Bishop Whipple about his work among the Indians. He told me that for eight years he saw no signs of making any impression, then suddenly they began to gather round him. Is not that a parable of the way in which God works ? Can we not find parallels in some facts of our own spiritual life ? But the state of your health is a serious consideration, and though I might exhort you to stand against outward discouragement, I could not ask you to go on with work which seriously affected your health. . . . You will know that you have my fullest sympathy in every way.'

‘ January 22, 1895.

‘ I agree with you in not liking any question involving an individual clergyman from the point of view of “ claims.” So I will tell you exactly what I think. I regard you as one of the best clergy in my diocese ; and in the interest of the Church generally it is desirable that your gifts should be employed in the sphere where they are the most useful. As a matter of fact, it is easier to find a man who can do the work of a parish like All Saints than to find a man who can do the more individual work of a large country parish. If you find, after a trial, that the latter work is what you can do best, it is clearly desirable that you should do it.’

He tried to help his clergy in all their difficulties :

To —

‘ December 26, 1892.

‘ It has struck me that your expenses at — at first may have been considerable, and that rents may be irregular. I therefore venture to send you a small donation from a fund at my disposal, which may perhaps help to tide over difficulties at first.’

‘ October 19, 1893.

‘ I have been able to receive a grant of 10*l.* to enable a clergyman to have a holiday. You need one : take it : and I hope the weather may continue.’

One of his clergy writes :

‘ I have wanted to write to you to say what a wonderful Bishop he was to me. . . . He was so great, but never too great but what he was ready to listen to my comparatively trifling troubles. I would not wish obviously that my name should be published in connexion with the enormous kindness he did me. I was in very great financial difficulties. He arranged with a bank, giving his name as a security, to find me money to tide over my difficulties. It was wonderful the way he did it, and for one who had no claims upon him. I wish this could be mentioned in his *Life*. He literally saved me, and enabled me to retain my position. All the world knew his intellectual power and his greatness as a Bishop, but I am thankful to have been amongst those who were privileged to know his tender sympathy and true-heartedness.’

The question of how to relieve the poverty of the clergy was constantly before the Bishop’s mind. He believed that the only really satisfactory plan was to aim steadily and constantly at the augmentation of small livings, by adding

to their endowment in accordance with the scheme laid down by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. But to meet the pressing needs of the moment the Diocesan Conference of 1893 decided to create a Diocesan Sustentation Fund, and the Bishop promised himself to give 200*l.* a year to it for five years.

To the Rev. Canon Watson

‘October 1, 1893.

‘I do not wish either to raise false expectations or to appeal in the first instance to the *clergy* to help their brethren. My own wish is that the new fund should be administered on the lines laid down by Heygate and yourself—*i.e.* that it should aim at some permanent result. I want it to be strictly supplementary to the augmentation of poor benefices, proceeding on the same lines but allowing greater latitude. . . . I wish in every case where possible to make grants from the fund bear some relation to local effort. Nor do I wish to receive applications, but would prefer to proceed on the recommendations of the Rural Deans. They would take cases in hand and stir up patrons and churchwardens to begin. When they came with a proposal we could meet it. . . . I want to put doles out of court to a great extent.’

‘October 20, 1893.

‘(1) Let us keep the words of the resolution : the grants are to “impoverished *benefices*” not *incumbents*.

‘(2) I propose to act on actual knowledge, with reference to population and poverty, and stir up a parish to do something. Then when the fund comes to an end, the local *something* may remain.’

He was quick to recognise any local effort :

To Mr. T. King Smith

‘I would like to express to you my satisfaction at the prompt and generous way in which the parishioners of Raunds have received my suggestion that better provision should be made for the vicar. It is very pleasant to me to find such an example of loyalty, and readiness to recognise the obligations which the changing conditions of the present day bring before some parishes.

‘The church was endowed in the past by voluntary contributions. When these are now insufficient, the fact has only to be faced, and there is willingness to provide. I feel sure that Mr. Oldroyd will be drawn more closely to his people by this mark of their goodwill.’

He was disappointed by the small response made by the appeal for the Clergy Sustentation Fund. He always felt that it ought to be taken in hand vigorously by the laity, and that it was impossible for the clergy to plead for their own order.

The question of the support of voluntary schools was of course constantly before him. He was convinced of the necessity of maintaining them. 'Only by the continuance of voluntary schools,' he said, 'can religious education be secured.' He illustrated his objection to a system of secular education from the State, supplemented by religious teaching from the various Christian bodies by a parallel: 'The method of dichotomy has always an appearance of simple justice; but the proposal of Solomon to apply it to a living organism revealed the true parent. Doubtless her preference for unity partook of the nature of obstruction.'¹ It seemed to him impossible that undenominational religious teaching should be satisfactory. He compared the supposed undenominational man with the ideal economic man created by a past generation of thinkers. 'When a religious difficulty cropped up about education, legislation cautiously and tentatively proceeded to invent another ideal being, "the undenominational man." He was constructed on the same principles as the economic man. . . . The undenominational man had for his subject matter religion, and therefore could not be entirely inhuman, but he was obtained by cutting out of his opinions everything which anyone else objected to.'² Yet he was always glad to recognise how good the religious teaching in the Board schools often was.

To the Rev. S. W. Wigg

'December 2, 1893.

'There is only one sentence in your pamphlet which I think doubtful. . . . "I do not think it well to discourage Board school teachers as though their work [in teaching religion] was necessarily useless. Nor do I think your dilemma, a fair one; as you roll together your conception of the obligation of a Board School teacher and the consequent result of his work. What happens is this. A strong Church-

¹ Primary Charge. *The Church and the Nation*, p. 68.

² Peterborough Diocesan Conference, 1895. *The Church and the Nation*, p. 133.

man is told to give undenominational teaching ; but he can only teach as things appear to him. So far as he teaches, he teaches earnestly and well : but some things which he would wish to teach, he is forbidden to teach ; this does not make his work dishonest to himself, nor useless to those he teaches.

‘ I only suggest some such sentence as this, as being fairer. “ Undenominational teaching can, strictly speaking, only be given by one who belongs to no denomination ; however it is given, it implies abstinence on the part of the teacher from showing how religious truth comes home to his own heart.” I dare say you can amend this.’

He was most anxious that no voluntary school should be given up unless it were absolutely necessary :

To the Rev. A. E. Oldroyd

‘ May 8, 1893.

‘ Your question is difficult. I see that a Board is inevitable. My general advice in such cases is ‘ keep the Church school, if possible, for a smaller number of children, *i.e.* let the Board do the main work, and make the Church school a select school. Can you keep it going for, say, 150 children? . . . I can only suggest to you to consider the possibility of financing a smaller school on a Church basis.” ’

In this case the school was ultimately enlarged by voluntary effort, and a Board avoided. The same was done at Market Harborough, where the Bishop encouraged the people to make the necessary effort to rebuild their schools. He strongly advised the formation of funds to help endangered schools.

To the Rev. Canon Stocks

‘ July 2, 1892.

‘ I am glad to hear that an effort is being made in Leicester to raise a small fund which may be applied to the general maintenance of the Church schools in Leicester. The knowledge that local effort can be supplemented by help from a central source will be a most valuable encouragement to such schools as may have to face special difficulties or meet sudden demands.’

To the Rev. S. W. Wigg

‘ April 28, 1894.

‘ There is no central organisation in Northampton, dealing with cases of endangered schools in the same way as does the Leicester Board. I wish you could do something towards emphasising the need of helping, by advice at all events, in

every case. Really schools are maintained very often by a little heartening from outside.'

He considered the struggle to maintain the voluntary schools as a fight for liberty. He said 'Surely true liberty consists in everyone having his own way so far as is compatible with the well-being of society as a whole. . . . We are not engaged in a hopeless struggle against a system which satisfies everybody except ourselves. On the contrary, we are maintaining a principle which makes for a larger conception of individual liberty than that which at present prevails.'¹

His own view as to the way in which the religious difficulty might be met is expressed in the following letter :

To Viscount Halifax

'Peterborough : December 18, 1894.

'The point about education schemes is not, whether or no we personally like them, but whether or no they have the best chance of being carried.

'Now I think the first requisite in politics is to have *a cry*. The cry which was raised in 1870 was "No children to be taught out of public money, except what the public approves." This has led to the endeavour to discover a common residuum, which really satisfies no one. But a great many people are obliged to profess that it is excellent because they see no way out.

'The only way out is to raise another cry, "All children to be taught the religion, or no religion, which their parents wish." This principle underlies your scheme, but is not stated with sufficient clearness to be catching. The scheme is too complicated, too like an attempt to get public money for voluntary schools without our equivalent.

'No scheme has a chance of being considered which is not a final settlement, or which merely aims at bolstering up voluntary schools against board schools. Your scheme is open to the second objection, and also to the first.

'I have my own view—who has not? Mine is contained in two provisions.

'(1) All efficient schools to be maintained out of the rates.

'(2) All managers to supply the religious teaching asked for by the parent, who shall fill up a paper, on sending his child to school.

¹ Primary Charge ; published in *The Church and the Nation*, pp. 70, 71.

'If the parental responsibility were recognised as the determining element in this matter, all the rest would follow. These are very crude opinions. We must give the Nonconformists a chance of a fresh start. This in politics is most desirable. No cry is ever dropped. You must substitute another which goes farther. You will rally no party in favour of saving voluntary schools as such. The Nonconformists are bound for consistency's sake—that fatal incubus in politics—to protest that they love the existing system. You can only cut the ground from under them by starting a new principle. Get the idea into people's heads that you are offering them permissive instead of prohibitive power, and they will possibly listen. Tell them, "At present you are allowed to say what other people's children shall not be taught; we wish you to say what your own shall be taught." Then you have popular control in an admissible form, and all dangerous questions are avoided. You recognise the parents' perfect liberty and provide for it. What more is requisite?

'Forgive the length of my remarks. But I wish we could all agree: at present our fertility is our bane. Some one once remarked that every invention which was useless for its original purpose could be used for making coffee.'

He wished to improve the quality of the religious teaching in the Church schools, and was not altogether satisfied with the mode of diocesan inspection of religious teaching :

To Bishop Mitchinson

'May 20, 1895.

'This raises the whole question of the nature of diocesan inspection. My own opinion generally is, that it has followed too closely the example of H.M. Inspectors and aims at the wrong end. It formalises and secularises what ought to be free and religious. The charge against — after all came to this, that he paid more attention to religion than to the kings of Israel. I know that he regarded religion perhaps too exclusively from its application to the soul in the sacraments . . . but he was on the right track. The mechanical system, however, has laid hold of the clergy, partly because it relieves them of responsibility. They say "Scripture knowledge is best taught by the master"; but I want them to teach religion. . . . How I am to get these ideas into the mind of the clergy, I do not know.'

Keenly conscious of the good work that might be done for the Church by laymen, the Bishop tried to help the Lay Readers to make their Association more effective :

To the Rev. Canon Stocks

‘April 12, 1892.

‘All points are dependent on the vitality of the system. If the lay readers already existing will organise themselves and show a desire for work, they will become a powerful body. But no organisation from above can create; it can only regulate and improve what exists.’

Above all, he tried to encourage his clergy to read and think. He organised courses of lectures for them in Leicester and Northampton on theology, Church history, and on social and economic questions. Cambridge professors and other students gave these lectures at his request, and lists of books to be studied were printed in the Diocesan Calendar.

He was equally desirous to deepen the spiritual life of his clergy, and in 1893 arranged for a clerical retreat to be held at Peterborough. In the letter of invitation he said: ‘The object is to provide the means for quiet meditation on the duties of our high calling, and on our own deficiencies. . . . The time will be spent in entire quietness, so as to enable us to withdraw from the anxieties of daily life, and encourage us to meditate upon God and our souls.’ Between seventy and eighty clergy attended the first retreat, which was conducted by Canon Newbolt. The Bishop himself undertook the reading aloud at meals. After this the retreat became an annual institution.

On first coming into the diocese, the Bishop was naturally beset with requests to do things of every kind and sort. ‘Please form a society for the protection of the new Bishop as soon as possible,’ he wrote. He accepted all requests to open churches, ‘believing that if a man could restore his church he deserved recognition.’ He presided at the meetings of many societies; but soon felt that he must learn how to refuse requests, though to say no was always difficult to him.

To the Rev. Canon Stocks

‘August 1, 1892.

‘I cannot possibly preside at all the meetings of all societies. I did so at first, but you must try and repress continuous applications.’

Some things he would never do :

To the Rev. —

‘December 24, 1894.

‘I am very glad that an attempt is to be made to free you from your difficulties. It has my warm sympathy, and I shall

be glad to express my approval in any way that you think proper. But I have a strict rule never to act as patron nor Mrs. Creighton as patroness of a Bazaar. The reason is obvious. There are so many for so many purposes, that if I accept any responsibility for them, the task would be overwhelming, and any principle of selection would create dissatisfaction. I could not give my name to all bazaars, I could not investigate them, I could not decide which were worthy of my support. I am therefore obliged to stand aloof from all. You will see that this is necessary. I can approve some objects, and I will gladly signify my approval in your case. But the particular method of a bazaar must stand on its own basis.'

The work of Missions always lay near his heart and the fact that the first Bishop of Mashonaland, Dr. Knight Bruce, was a former Merton pupil of his, led to his being the first president of the Mashonaland Missionary Association, in which he always took much interest. He was not a total abstainer, but was glad to help the temperance cause in every way in his power. Mr. Grose Hodge says :

'It is perhaps due to his wide grasp of the Church's work as a whole that he was never absorbed in any one section of it. He could always see the other side. We could never make him an enthusiast in temperance work, though he recognised and spoke with admiration of the enthusiasm it kindled in others. The Diocesan Society flourished, and every officer of it felt that he had behind him in his Bishop one who knew the work he was doing, and who trusted him to do it, and would give most kindly and wise direction whenever he sought it.'

His speaking at temperance meetings won the approval even of such an enthusiast as Dr. Temple. His support and interest facilitated the carrying out of the scheme for founding a Diocesan Home for Fallen Women under the care of the Wantage Sisters, in the quiet village of Ketton. He cherished a hope of instituting an order of deaconesses in his diocese, but found the time not ripe, as the clergy did not seem to him sufficiently alive to the need for the work of highly trained women. He hoped that the day would come, but he was not given time to make the beginning.

The large schemes for diocesan work did not keep him

from attention to details. He was a great stickler for verbal accuracy in anything written, and he was very particular as to the exact wording of any forms or notices.

To Canon Watson

‘October 16, 1893.

‘. . . By all means print the Thanksgiving Collects with my authorisation. Only the expression “Collect *for* the day” is not accurate. In the days when Rubrics were drawn, people spoke grammar and talked sense. The Collect is *of* the day, and is followed by a prayer *for* grace. But no man ought to pray *for* the 25th Sunday after Trinity. It would be a gross piece of superstition.’

To the Rev. S. W. Wigg

‘It is well not to travel into controverted questions more than is strictly necessary. . . . On page 10 I suggest for “an act of folly,” a breach of diocesan duty.’

In the interests of accuracy he revised the brief historical chronicle at the beginning of the Diocesan Magazine.

To the Rev. Canon Watson

‘September 5, 1891.

‘I have made a few changes in the earlier part of the Chronicle, revising it in the light of recent work, and striking out things doubtful.

‘St. Alban is so mythical and the date so hard to assign, that I think he can scarcely be made into a historical character. By inserting Aidan as parallel to Augustine, it is made clear that Christianity came into England from the north as well as the south, from Ireland as much as Rome.

‘Alfred did not divide the kingdom into counties ; this is a pure legend.

‘October 30, 1891.

‘In the Chronicle I would not put the names of the British Bishops who are recorded as attending the Council of Arles. I cannot think they are genuine. . . . I am of opinion that discreet silence concerning them is best.’

‘January 5, 1892.

‘My objection was to the insertion of names which are of doubtful identification into a short record of Church history. When the whole thing is done in two pages, the insertion of three names which require a commentary is disproportionate to the length of the sketch. . . . I always object to put in a brief sketch as an assured fact that which is only conjecture. Let us stick to assured facts.’

Nothing that concerned the welfare of his clergy was too small for his attention. If he received any communication or complaint from a parishioner, it was his practice to refer it to the incumbent in the first instance. When twenty-eight parishioners in a country village petitioned him against the hymn-book used in their church, he wrote to inform the incumbent of the fact, and added :

‘ I need not say that the choice of a hymn-book rests with the incumbent : but the discretion of the incumbent is limited by the wishes of the people. I have no wish to offer you any advice on the question itself : but it is well to meet the desires of the people as far as possible. . . . I must answer the representation in some form, and you must decide what that form is to be.’

Nothing caused the Bishop such deep pain as the knowledge of real evil-doing on the part of any of his clergy. The thought of such cases, where often he could do nothing, used to haunt him. He tried to deal with them privately, and to trust to the force of his own exhortation rather than to the law. His Chancellor writes :

‘ Cases of scandal and immorality he managed without public litigation. In such cases, as in everything else, he was eminently practical. On one occasion there was a serious and apparently well-supported accusation made against one of his clergy. The Bishop, however, thought it right before taking proceedings to send down the deputy registrar to investigate the matter. This investigation resulted in the collapse of the whole thing, and the Bishop did not fail to do public justice to the incriminated clergyman.’

On another occasion the Bishop wrote to his Chancellor :

‘ March 12, 1892.

‘ I had before me a case of a criminous clerk, which presented many legal difficulties. I acted upon my ecclesiastical conception of my office, and asked him to come and see me this morning as his Bishop. This was a step involving many difficulties, and I was anxious for a talk with you last night that I might have your advice how the interview might best be conducted without prejudice either to my future position as judge, or to the position of the accused. . . . But the matter is settled. The man came in response to my original call, and submitted himself entirely to me as his Father in

God. I had taken the precaution to have a deed of resignation in my pocket ; he signed it on the spot.

‘I cannot tell you how thankful I am. If I can pull through all my cases in that way—but that is too much to expect.’

Fortunately he was never driven to a prosecution. But the exertion of his personal power, or his authority as a Bishop in such dealings with criminous clergy, tried him to the very depths of his heart. A man of his tender sympathy, combined with so stern a sense of justice, could not see a fellow-creature, above all a brother priest, abased before him without painful emotion.

His predecessor’s chancellor had resigned, and on coming into his office the Bishop had at once to appoint a new chancellor. After careful inquiry, he offered the post to Mr. G. H. Blakesley :

‘April 20, 1891.

‘Dear Mr. Blakesley,—I should like to say one or two things. First, my reason for hoping that you would accept the post of chancellor was entirely founded on a desire to secure the services of the best man I could discover by such enquiries as I was able to make. Regarding all such appointments as trusts, I can only say that I have in your case acted to the best of my ability on public grounds.

‘Next let me express my hope that our relationship may rest on personal friendship and not stay on mere official and formal lines.’

Mr. Blakesley considers that the Bishop’s ‘power in the diocese’ depended not so much on his official position as on the personal influence exercised by his character. ‘An unclouded intellectual fairness seemed to disarm prejudice. He would not meet a proposition with the opposite proposition but with a reason, probably in the form of a question addressed to one’s reasoning powers. He would force a man to pay attention to his reasoning powers ; and in attending to that, the man would forget to keep his passion boiling. He could get things done. He instituted a plan of diocesan trustees, which has since served as a model for other dioceses.’

To Mr. G. H. Blakesley

‘September 14, 1892.

‘There is a long-standing committee about Diocesan Trusts. I told them they positively *must* have a scheme ready for our

meeting, and in such a shape that it could be acted upon. This stirred them up, and I have heard from time to time of their progress. But I have not yet seen the scheme nor your opinion. . . . I am further enquiring into the titles of all the school buildings in the Diocese, and shall find ample scope for the activity of the Trustees as soon as they come into existence.'

Whilst at Peterborough the Bishop was little troubled with ritual difficulties. At the Cathedral he fell in with the wishes of the Chapter in introducing the Eastward position. This had always been his habit, but he never wished to offend others. Mr. Blakesley says :

'It is hardly necessary to mention his natural and unaffected good feeling in dealing with people. I remember that in the course of his visitation he came to a place where the clergyman, a very charming old gentleman, had kept up the practice of consecrating on the north side. I do not know whether the Bishop had any notice of this beforehand, but, at all events, just before the service he asked this clergyman what was his practice ; and upon that information took care to follow the same practice in conducting the service. Afterwards I heard the clergyman thanking the Bishop most warmly ; and the Bishop, though extremely pleased at the old man's appreciation of the consideration shown him, was rather surprised that he should make so much of it.'

It of course sometimes happened that he had to try to make peace between an incumbent and his people. One of the most difficult cases of this kind led to a discontented parishioner finally resorting to the painful irreverence of sending the Bishop by post a consecrated wafer, which he had received at Holy Communion. The Bishop at once wrote to the incumbent in question :

'I again ask you to submit to my judgment in the matter and to use some form of bread which resembles that in common use. Nothing need be said, and everyone would feel grateful. The broad reason which I would put before you is this. The symbolism contained in the material of the Sacrament is the sanctification of our life, its needs and its feelings. If the bread is not understood to be bread, the meaning of the Sacrament is obscured. Your people do not understand what you use to be bread : they have a physical repugnance to its consumption as such. The matter is too

serious for a trial of perseverance between you and them. I ask you on this point to give way.'

The incumbent answered 'that if the Bishop would *command* him to make this change and authorise him to state as much from the pulpit, he would not venture to disobey ; adding ' that he thought this was a matter within the discretion of the Ordinary.'

To this the Bishop, who had already been much troubled by the discord in this particular parish, answered, with considerable sternness :

' I consider that the relationship of a bishop to his clergy is paternal and hortatory. I never have recourse to my authority as Ordinary unless I am appealed to in that capacity. No good purpose would be served by my giving you an order which you took as the text for a sermon.

' I am totally unable to follow your arguments. They are excellent as abstract propositions, but seem to me to have no relation to the actual condition of affairs in the parish of —.

' It is, however, useless for me to continue to discuss matters with you. I can only say that I cannot agree with your assertion of clerical autocracy at all costs ; that I consider your attitude as self-willed and lacking in that sympathy with your people which is part of the clerical office, indeed a very large part ; that you seem to me to forget your duty "to maintain and set forward as much as lieth in you, quietness, peace, and love, among all Christian people, and especially among them that are committed to your charge."

' I can only answer any letters which I may receive from your parishioners by saying that I have tendered my advice, and that it has been refused.

' I am very sorry to be obliged to write to any of my clergy, especially to one whose zeal and good intentions I admire, in this manner.'

The incumbent was deeply wounded by the Bishop's letter, which he considered unjust. At the same time he expressed his regret that he had used such a word as ' Ordinary ' in a loose and popular sense, and assured the Bishop that he had no desire to claim excessive independence. To this the Bishop answered :

‘Your letter begins by accusing me of injustice and ends by saying that you are not surprised that your language conveyed to me an erroneous impression.

‘The facts are that I have twice made a request to you, and you have twice refused to comply with it. In your second refusal you seemed to me to challenge me to give you a formal command, and you implied that, if you obeyed, you reserved your right to criticise it publicly.

‘My opinion is that in the present condition of —— parish the use of wafer bread is undesirable and should be discontinued.

‘If you think it better to inform your people that you discontinue its use at my request, I have no objection. If that were the meaning of your letter, I am sorry that I misunderstood it.

‘My conception of the Episcopal Office is that of a friendly and paternal relationship with my clergy. I do not wish to tender advice, or to interfere with their discretion, without strong reason, and a sense of responsibility. If any one of them refuses my advice and appeals to my authority, it is a breach of my friendly and paternal relationship which cannot be restored.

‘If your meaning was that you wished for my permission to state that I was responsible for advising you to discontinue a certain use which you had adopted, and that you followed my advice, I am quite willing that you should do so. But it must remain a matter of *advice*, not of *command*. We are still working together, though you may feel some reluctance.’

The Bishop’s advice was followed; and a little while afterwards the incumbent wrote to tell him that the consequences which he had feared might result had not ensued, but that, on the contrary, he had observed a certain softening of asperity in some quarters. When some time later this clergyman left the diocese the Bishop wrote to express his regret at his departure, adding: ‘I am sorry that on points of practical wisdom you did not always agree with me; but that did not affect my respect for your qualities and my sympathy with your objects.’ And the clergyman, looking back on the past, says: ‘He and I differed sharply about the way of treating certain people. I can see now that he was at least sometimes right and I was wrong; but still I think he made some mistakes. I was very angry at the

time, much more angry than I had any right to be, and he treated me with unfailing kindness.'

The Bishop had a great deal of patronage in his hands, but it was for the most part very poor. He was clear that it was his duty to attend first to the claims of his own clergy, and he valued lay patronage because it brought new blood into a diocese. It was grievous to him to have to ask men to undertake hard posts without adequate remuneration.

To the Rev. Canon Stocks

'December 17, 1891.

'Do you know of anyone with a missionary spirit who would like a benefice of 500 people which is only worth 80*l.* a year without a house? It is dreadful to have to ask such a question.'

Even such appointments were not made without the utmost possible care. 'However poor a benefice may be,' he wrote, 'I could not offer it to a man who was not, so far as I could judge, well fitted for it.'

The diocese soon experienced the advantage of the Bishop's business capacity. He was a first-rate chairman, always absolutely just, never taking up the time of a meeting himself or trying to force his views upon it; but ever ready to find a way out of a difficulty, to clear up the point at issue, or show the real bearing of the question under discussion. His care in the use of words made him skilful in the framing of rules or resolutions. His unvarying good-temper enabled him to keep a meeting cheerful and to enliven it by an occasional joke. He neither allowed time to be wasted in needless discussion, nor did he drive the business through so quickly as to give the impression that the only thing he wanted was to get it over. What men felt was that he wished the right thing to be done. If his way differed from theirs, he did not want them to take it because it was his way.

Archdeacon Lightfoot writes: 'His clear grasp of business, wonderful memory, and readiness to listen to current diocesan matters often impressed me. In clerical discussions he was able to dismiss with great decision, and with no trace whatever of acerbity, subjects brought forward for discussion which he thought it undesirable to consider. He could keep

discussions close to the point and control meetings in a remarkably easy manner.' He bore no malice on account of opposition and frequently gave way to it when he thought the point in question was not important enough to justify a struggle, although his own opinion remained unaltered.'

Shortly after his coming the regulations for both the Diocesan and Ruri-decanal Conferences were revised. All his suggestions were in the direction of greater freedom. Elections were to be by ballot, speakers who were not members of the Conference might be invited for any particular discussion. He did not wish, as had been the custom, himself to suggest the subjects for discussion.

To Bishop Mitchinson

' March 7, 1892.

'Your suggestion about Ruri-decanal Conferences exactly fits with mine own opinion. There are no questions on which I want the opinion of my diocese : but I should like to know what amount of vitality the Conferences possess, and I think they ought to have powers of initiative. I should learn more at present certainly from knowing what they think important, than from consulting them on any fixed points.'

In the general work of the Diocese, he had the assistance of Dr. Thicknesse, Bishop of Leicester, as his Suffragan, and of Bishop Mitchinson, then rector of Sibstone, as Assistant Bishop. He was always ready to consult them as well as his Archdeacons and Rural Deans on all matters of importance, and treated all those who worked with him with the most absolute confidence and frankness.

He kept no domestic chaplain. Mr. G. J. Gray¹ helped him as private secretary for an hour or so every day. All letters of importance he answered himself; he was a very quick and terse letter writer, and got through his correspondence with much rapidity. He had no rules of order or method for himself, and never kept his letters or papers on any apparent system, nor did he like that others should arrange them for him. Yet somehow business was always promptly attended to, important and often unimportant letters were at once answered. Papers were not mislaid, and in the midst of

¹ Mr. Gray was then head clerk in the Chapter Clerk's Office. He has since been appointed Chapter Clerk. The Bishop found his services at all times most valuable.

the apparent disorder of his study tables, he generally knew how to find what he wanted. Only sometimes he would come in despair to ask me to find a book or paper which he had mislaid. But it was useless to attempt to get him to submit to have his papers kept with any system. He hated having anything thrown away; and it seemed to cause him real agony when at the beginning of the year I persuaded him to allow me to sort his baskets full of pamphlets and papers of all kinds. It was a wrench to give up even what seemed quite useless to the waste-paper basket; and it was only for a short while at a time that he could bear the misery of sorting or arranging. Yet he did not store useless masses of letters, and used, at the cost of great effort, to go through at the beginning of each year the correspondence of the last, and allow what he wished kept to be sorted and filed. His methods were a curious mixture of disorder and order. In the ordinary living rooms of the house and in the garden he noted the smallest piece of disorder and was insistent to have it remedied, but he did not mind what others would have considered disorder in his own study. He was very particular in his use of books, and could not bear to see any of his books carelessly handled; sometimes it seemed as if he hardly liked them to be even read. He valued a book as a book, and though trash of all kinds, first books of poems, sermons &c. were sent him, he would seldom allow any book to be destroyed, and a place for everything had to be found on his shelves. He would say, 'You can never tell what may not turn out to be useful, but when a thing is once destroyed it can never be used.'

When he was at home at Peterborough he seldom did any business in the evening. His working time was the morning, and the hours between tea and dinner at eight o'clock. He always allowed himself to be interrupted by any one who wished to see him. 'He used to maintain,' says Canon Clayton, 'that he was not really interrupted in his work by suspensions of it. 'I shall go on with what I am doing,' he once said, 'the moment you leave, just as if you had not been here at all.'

He gave the impression that he was ready to talk freely and unguardedly with anybody about anybody; and to invite

expressions of opinion upon all sorts of questions, personal, practical, or theoretical. People did not always realise that this was his method of gaining information, and that he gave much less than he got. In home life he talked little about diocesan affairs, though he was always ready to tell what he had done and whom he had seen, but he was utterly averse to all gossip or unnecessary talk about what he considered mere matters of business, and considered it much better that his wife and family should be really ignorant of matters which related purely to his official life; he preferred to talk with them on other subjects. Some hasty observers may have put him down as indiscreet, but those who knew him best, knew how scrupulously discreet he really was. Of course many stories got about with regard to his sayings and doings, but he never troubled to contradict them, and after a while he made a resolution to destroy all anonymous letters unread. To a clergyman who had difficulties with his parishioners and who wrote to ask him whether it was true as reported that the Bishop had said "that it was a pity that Mr.— was upsetting his parish for the sake of one detail of ritual derived from the Hereford use," he answered :

'You really ought not to ask for explanation of reported remarks which have no authority. But I do not mind saying for this time only that I could not have made the remark you quote, for I am ignorant of any Hereford ritual, and I do not know why you are upsetting the work of —— parish.'

As was natural many difficult questions were asked him by his clergy as to their procedure under exceptional cases. The following letters will give an idea of his way of dealing with some of these problems :

To the Rev. E. Grose Hodge

'April 6, 1892.

'Dear Hodge,—The question of the use of unfermented beverage at the Holy Communion has, I believe, been discussed at the Lambeth Conference, and has been emphatically negated.

'The grounds, I think, are mainly two: (1) the objection to make any change in the elements which were used at the institution.

'(2) The nature of the symbolism involved in the emblems chosen. Wine seems to symbolise the emotional

and passionate part of human nature, which must not be cast out but be sanctified.

‘While, therefore, it is impossible to change a divine ordinance, there still remains the question, can occasional difficulties be met?’

‘I think there are at least three ways in which difficulties can be minimised, if not overcome.

‘(1) The wine used may be mixed with water, without any ceremonial, by the simple expedient of half filling the cup with water, before it is placed on the Credence or on the Holy Table.

‘(2) In the case of those who think it unwise for them to partake of wine, however diluted, I have no hesitation in saying that they receive the full benefit of the Sacrament if they partake only under one kind. My practical advice would be to any clergyman who was convinced that the objection was well founded, that he should administer the bread and give the cup into the hand, but be satisfied with a symbolical action of drinking.

‘(3) It is possible, if there are objections to what I have just said, for such persons to be present at Holy Communion without communicating bodily, but with the desire to do so by faith.

‘The rubric at the end of the “Communion of the Sick” justifies this in the case of “any just impediment.”

‘All these suggestions are, I am aware, to some people unpalatable, because they are connected in their mind with ceremonies or with ideas with which they do not wish to connect themselves. This is no doubt unfortunate; but I think it is well to consider things in themselves, apart from associations which are not necessarily relevant.

‘My point is, that these are modes by which scruples can be met, without taking the very serious step of altering the Institution of the Sacrament. I do not say that *any* mode is free from objections. But remember that the whole history of medieval abuses shows the danger of departing a hair’s breadth from Scriptural and primitive usage. All that turned into abuse was at first successful and convenient, and met some need. What was done for practical utility became a basis of speculative ingenuity. Think of the practical difficulties which would attend on *occasional* and *exceptional* Celebration. How would you announce it? Would it not form two parties? How far might it be extended? What amount of scruple, or desire, or convenience would be necessary to justify some other change?

‘Again I say the rite itself must remain unchanged ; but it is possible, with reasonable latitude, for the individual to find a means of adapting the universal rite to his particular case. I have merely made suggestions ; there may be other modes which have not occurred to me.’

To the Rev. E. A. Knox (now Bishop of Manchester) in answer to a question about admitting certain nonconformists to Communion, who were unwilling to be confirmed lest they should seem to cast a slur upon the status of communicants in nonconformist bodies with which they had been long associated :

‘Peterborough : September 22, 1892.

‘My dear Knox,—. . . The question which you ask me is a difficult one, and I have never had an opportunity of discussing it with other bishops. When my advice has been asked by any of my clergy, it has always been given on the side of freedom. In the case which you submit, two unconfirmed persons are admitted to Holy Communion ; but I gather that from time to time a hope is expressed that they will be confirmed, so as to do away with an irregularity. I presume that the irregularity arises in consequence of the Rubric “None shall be admitted to the Holy Communion, until such time as he be confirmed or be ready and desirous to be confirmed.” The argument from this is that the process contemplated by the Prayer Book is—Baptism, Confirmation, Communion ; and the clergyman does not like to pass over or omit one member of it.

‘The case so stated is a strong one. It can only be met by pleading for an *historical* interpretation of the Rubric, on the ground that it was framed for normal cases and did not contemplate the case of nonconformists. They were baptized outside the Church of England, but their baptism is valid. They went through instruction for the completion of their baptism, and that completion of their spiritual maturity was recognised by the officers of their own body ; but here rises the vital question—can that recognition be regarded as valid, *i.e.* as taking the place of Confirmation ?

‘The statement of the position which you lay before me leads up to the answer, *Yes*. And if the clergyman in question admitted the persons you mention to Communion without raising some sort of protest, it would be because he also answered, *Yes*. I think you will agree with me that this would be a great responsibility for any individual to undertake. The position of the Church of England in maintaining Apostolic usage as regards Confirmation is unique in Christendom, and follows Scriptural precedent without explaining away anything. The Greek Church combine

Confirmation with Baptism. The Roman Church omits the outward sign, there is no laying on of hands. The Church of England without exalting Confirmation to a place which it cannot claim, follows the primitive record strictly to the letter.

‘I think that a clergyman is acting up to the spirit of the Church of England if he practically says: “I cannot excommunicate you because you grew up in a system different from my own. But I am bound to call your attention to that system as a whole. Look at it altogether. If you enter it in part, there are obvious advantages in entering upon all that it can give.”

‘The advice which I have given in particular cases has been founded on this view. The result has been in almost every case that scruples have disappeared. I am willing to confirm privately, even to adapt the questions in the Confirmation Service to the particular case. But I think it would be difficult to lay down an equivalent to Confirmation in other systems, or to dispense from it absolutely in some cases.

‘This is my position as an interpreter of the Prayer Book. But I fully sympathise with the difficulties of your friends. It is to be observed, however, that in their case, as I gather, they have been admitted to Communion, without Confirmation—so that *subsequent* Confirmation would not cast a slur upon nonconforming Communion, nor admit the absolute necessity of Confirmation as a condition precedent. It would simply mean an acceptance of the whole system of the Church of England; and a belief that there was some value in a rite which, though not founded by Christ Himself, was used by the Apostles.’

‘Peterborough: September 24, 1892.

‘Dear Knox,—Let me supplement my last letter by one or two remarks.

‘(1) It would not naturally be the duty of a clergyman to enquire into the qualifications of a communicant who was not a parishioner. The fact that they presented themselves, and that he had no reason for thinking them unworthy, would be a sufficient justification for his administration. But the position of the parish priest, who has full knowledge, is different. He is bound to make up his mind about the meaning of the rubric “ready and desirous to be confirmed.”

‘(2) I, as bishop, on being asked my opinion about the clergyman’s action, am bound to resolve myself into a judge. I cannot, if he interprets that rubric literally, override his interpretation and order him to administer. In the same way, I can imagine some principles of interpretation which, if

laid before me, would be sufficient to enable me not to order him to discontinue administering if he thought fit to do so.

‘(3) But this is purely judicial. Personally I see the difficulties on both sides of those concerned. On both sides there are conscientious scruples. I gather that the clergyman has already surrendered some of his. He commits what he believes to be an irregularity, but expresses a hope that it may cease. By so doing he has removed some of the scruples on the other side, and has raised the question, ‘Can his sacrifice of strict logical principle be met by a charitable concession?’

‘(4) I have not entered upon the question of the value or meaning of Confirmation in itself. It is enough to say that any effort to draw nigh to God in a definite manner becomes to the faithful heart all that the rite implies and even more.’

‘St. Giles’ Vicarage, Northampton : September 29, 1892.

‘Dear Knox,—I am very much obliged to you for sending me Mrs. ———’s letter, and I am very thankful that anything I said has been of use in bringing about a result which will help in promoting harmonious co-operation in our Master’s service : I fully appreciate Mrs. ———’s attitude, and her sacrifice of some scruples to the cause of practical unity. . . I need not say how grateful I am to you for helping towards this result. I always feel that our differences come far more from unchristian temper than from any other cause. In the presence of our Lord they surely reduce themselves to small proportions.’

In answer to a question about admitting to Communion a man who had married his deceased wife’s sister :

‘November 14, 1892.

‘The question which you refer to me about admitting to Holy Communion persons not legally married is a serious one. I have had some difficulty in deciding what answer to give. But it seems to me that, so long as two persons *continue to live together unlawfully*, it is impossible to treat them as pious Christian people. If they pledge their word that they do not cohabit, but only live under the same roof, that alters the case. But so long as illicit cohabitation continues, the offence continues.

‘It may be that there are extenuating circumstances. You may explain that in refusing Communion you are not judging. But the Christian community must be protected from open scandal, and you are a guardian of that community. Deprivation of Holy Communion is a loss of privilege, which

is forfeited so long as the offence remains. But deprivation of Holy Communion does not cut off from Communion with God. The Church is more merciful than society : God is more merciful than the Church dares to be. In our desire to approximate to what we hope may be God's judgment, we must not sacrifice the principles which God has commanded His Church to enforce. I do not see how those who continue to live in a state forbidden by the law of the Church and the State alike can expect to do so without forfeiting something.'

About the admission of a Roman Priest into the Anglican Church :

'January 5, 1893.

'I liked what I saw of Mr. —, but I did not gather that his reasons for leaving the Roman Church went further than a desire to be free from an excessive discipline, and I suspected that this particularly pointed to matrimony. The Romans always say that a priest only leaves them to get married. This may be so, but it does not affect the question, as marriage may well be a point round which a good many considerations centre. I should be very glad if you would make quiet enquiry about the opinion held of him in his own body at —. I do not wish to make it easy for him to come over.'

In answer to a question as to what a clergyman should do who had been asked by a Presbyterian living in his parish, a small country village, to baptize his child, with the stipulation that the child should not be brought into the English Church :

'September 5, 1893.

'The case which you bring before me does not seem to me to fall under the Rubric, which was framed in view only of members of our Church, and prescribes the normal proceeding towards them.

'You are not asked to officiate as a clergyman towards members of your own Church : but you are asked to perform a rite for those who are not under your spiritual jurisdiction, to help them, in fact, in an emergency.

'Such a matter is in your discretion. Baptism is a rite of almost every religious body : it may be performed by a layman in case of necessity. In this instance you are asked to perform it, not as a Priest of the Church of England, but as a minister of religion. It is something outside your official duty and not governed by the same rules. Public baptism involves both baptism and reception into the Church of England. I do not see any reason why, in your capacity as a spiritual person, you should not perform the first part privately, though

you are not requested to do the second publicly. It is in itself important that a child should be baptized into Christ's Church; and I should be inclined to baptize anyone who applied, on grounds of Christian charity.'

In reply to a question how to deal with a Rechabite who refused to receive the Chalice at Holy Communion:

'February 1, 1894.

'I think that it is entirely unreasonable, even partaking of the nature of schism, for an individual to set himself up against the custom of the universal Church. Further, such a position shows an ignorance of the meaning of the Sacrament of the Altar, in which the Bread symbolises the sanctification of our body in all its necessary wants, and the wine symbolises the sanctification of all our emotions and imaginings. To refuse to communicate under both kinds is to condemn as necessarily evil all the emotional and artistic side of life. Is this what your man really and seriously means?

'At the same time there is no doubt that Communion under one kind is complete; and I would not limit your discretion if you thought fit to use it.

'In former times a man who had a scruple recognised that he was a "weak brother:" there is just a chance now that scrupulosity should be claimed as a sign of strength.

'I should advise you that you told your patient, for I must regard him as a moral invalid, to attend and make an act of spiritual Communion without partaking. There is a certain danger of promoting sectarianism by two modes of administration. It would be a question for discussion which was better and a controversy would not be edifying.'

In answer to a question about the conduct of burials during an epidemic of small-pox:

'May 14, 1894.

'The Rubric which says that the priest shall "go either into the church or towards the *grave*" recognises a discretionary power, which it would be wise to use in the case of infection. It would seem that the direction "after they are come into the church" specifies the use of the Psalm and lesson only in cases when the church is entered. In the case when you go direct to the grave, they are not obligatory, and I do not suppose that many people would wish them to be said in the open air. If they did, it might be well to consult their wishes.'

About a child baptized by a Roman Priest :

‘ May 15, 1894.

‘ It seems to me (1) that the baptism was of course valid, and therefore cannot be repeated.

‘ (2) The form of reception in the Prayer-book is “into the congregation of Christ’s flock,” i.e. *into the universal Church of Christ*, which is apart from, and beyond, differences such as exist between the Church of England and the Church of Rome. There is no form of reception for a child into the Church of England *as such*, and I do not think such a form is necessary. I therefore cannot advise you to use the Prayer-book form in this sense.

‘ But, this is to be remembered. Baptism is into Christ’s Church ; *not* into the Roman branch of it. The fact that the child has been baptized by a Roman priest establishes no claim that it should be brought up according to Roman teaching. It is just as much a member of the Church of England as of the Church of Rome ; it is “a member of Christ.” The father can decide with perfect freedom which communion it is to belong to, and what tenets it is to be taught.’

To the Rev. Canon Stocks

‘ Peterborough : March 18, 1895.

‘ I returned late on Saturday, better for my holiday, though it was not a great success as regards weather. . . .

‘ The marriage question is dreadfully difficult, and would require a volume. I am sorry for the attitude recently taken up by Luckock and others. It is not founded on sound knowledge. Speaking generally, the question raises in its extremist form the problem of the actual application to life of the principles of the Gospel. We must remember—it cannot be remembered too much—that the Gospel consists of principles not of maxims. The only possible principle concerning marriage is that it is indissoluble. But all principles are set aside by sin : and our Lord recognised that as regards marriage (the interpretation of *πορνεία* as prenuptial unchastity will not do. Such a man as the Bishop of Lincoln is against it on patristic grounds. It is untenable). I must own myself to a strong indisposition to set the Church against the State on such a point as the interpretation of the latitude to be assigned to the permission of dissolution which our Lord’s words imply. It has always been found difficult to adjust law and equity. But is the Church on this point to admit of no equity ? The medieval system was a mass of fictions or dispensations and subterfuges. The question has always troubled the English Church. Cranmer, Andrewes,

Laud, alike had no fixed principles. Now the State has taken the matter into its hand and marriages are primarily civil contracts. We as Christians abhor divorce: but when a divorce has been judged necessary, are we to refuse any liberty to the innocent and wronged party? It seems to me a matter for our discretion on equitable grounds in each case. I could not advise any of my clergy to refuse to solemnise a marriage of an innocent person who genuinely desired God's blessing. I prefer to err on the side of charity.'

Writing to Archbishop Benson, he treats of the same subject:

'Peterborough: October 22, 1895.

'My dear Archbishop,—. . . As I am writing on historical subjects, let me advise you, if you wish to laugh, to read a review by Professor Maitland in the last number of the "Historical Review" of Luckock's "Marriage." It only deals with a small point in medieval history, but is delightfully funny.

'On that terrible question of Marriage, Burnet says that Cranmer wrote a "large book" on Northampton's case, "the original of which I have perused." If this could be found, it would be most valuable. What people call "the law of the Church" became unworkable when dispensations were cut off. English Canonists then disappeared, and ecclesiastical lawyers tried to work tentatively a system which they did not understand. Cranmer must have come to some definite conclusions and probably thought the matter out.'

About the use of the Athanasian Creed:

'December 31, 1895.

'I have received a complaint that on Christmas day you did not say the Creed of St. Athanasius in your church. I can only call your attention to the fact that the Rubric enjoins its use on certain Holy days and leaves no discretion either to you or me.'¹

¹ At Embleton Dr. Creighton had never said the Athanasian Creed. He considered it too difficult for his people, and nobody interfered to prevent him doing as he liked. Probably he was altogether more individual than he would have been later, when experience had taught him more about the necessity for order and submission to authority. For himself he valued the Creed and I have often heard him defend it.

CHAPTER III

LIFE AT PETERBOROUGH

WHEN he became a bishop, Dr. Creighton knew that he must give up hope of much study or literary production, and he at once resigned his editorship of the 'Historical Review.'

To Mr. R. L. Poole

'Cambridge : February 25, 1891.

'I should like your advice about the editorship of the "Historical Review." My first thought has not come off. . . . Now I think that, though you will be the motive power, it is well to have a figure-head; a man who can say *no* without giving offence, who can resist pressure because he is removed from it. My chief work has been in this sphere, and such success as I have had, is due to the fact that I have managed to keep a team together without giving much offence, and have not seemed to favour any particular school. I have even admitted drivel to secure breadth.'

To Mr. C. J. Longman

'March 3, 1891.

'I have succeeded in persuading S. R. Gardiner to undertake the supervision of the "Historical Review." This will do excellently. Poole will do the hard work willingly, but Gardiner will direct.'

To Mr. R. L. Poole

'April 6, 1891.

'Do not alter the title of the Review : let me wear to the last my only actual dignities . . . When I have ceased to be editor, I should like just so much recognition as to be put on the free list.'

'April 13, 1891.

'I look with great regret on the severance of our connexion, which has been very pleasant to me in every way. We had a difficult job to do and we have done it somehow : at all events we have something to show in the way of an accomplished fact. It is improbable that I should ever do so big a piece of work again with so little friction and with such

ready help. I can only thank you very sincerely for your willingness to save me, and go beyond the bond, whenever I imposed upon your good nature. I hope you will make use of my Cambridge ladies for reviews.'

He always continued to be interested in the Review, and wrote for it from time to time. He hoped still to go on with the 'History of the Papacy' even if his progress must be very slow, and had brought with him from Cambridge a new volume 'within measurable distance of completion,' at which he worked whenever he could find a moment. He also amused himself with continuing a series of articles which he had begun for 'The Leisure Hour' on the English Shires. These articles were 'the result of impressions produced by rambles in various parts of England, and their object was to point out those local peculiarities of 'life, manners and customs, which year by year are growing less strong, as people move about more freely,' to try to see how those local peculiarities arose, and to 'bring out the traces of the independent life of the English shires.' They show the spirit in which he himself rambled about England, and made the country which he saw tell him its story. They were published in book form in 1897, but, as he stated in the preface, increasing occupation had prevented him from finishing the series. He added, 'I still sometimes hope that I may succeed in doing so,' and one day at Fulham, in a spare half-hour, he sat down and wrote the first page of a new article which was never finished.

The alterations at the Palace were finished by the end of 1891, and at Christmas time we entertained at supper the fifty workmen who had been employed on them. The Bishop thoroughly enjoyed an occasion of this kind. He carved for the men, and talked to as many of them individually as he could, and was present all through the evening when his children entertained the company with music, and the workmen also were persuaded to sing and recite. In subsequent years we entertained in the same way the railwaymen, the postmen, and policemen, and the schoolmasters and mistresses of Peterborough. A great many young people always gathered at the Palace for Christmas, and any others resident in the precincts were invited to join in our Christmas

tree and games, or to come and dance in our hall in the evenings. The Bishop, who had never danced except with his choir at Embleton since he was an undergraduate, now discovered how much he enjoyed dancing with his children. Not only he, but other bishops and dignitaries of the Church who stayed with us, used to take part with much vigour in the games with the younger children after tea, or in the dancing after dinner for the older ones which enlivened the holidays. This first year we experienced for the only time perfect fen-skating. The meadows round Peterborough were flooded, and a hard frost just before Christmas converted them into sheets of clear black ice. The Bishop was tempted to join the skaters, and delighted in the exercise. In later years he played hockey when possible for his winter exercise. Two afternoons a week were fixed as hockey afternoons, on which other young people from the neighbourhood joined our children and played in one of the Palace fields. The game lost much of its excitement when the Bishop was not at home. We played with more vigour than science, and many were persuaded to join who had never thought of sharing in such a game; even the district nurses found hockey at the Palace a pleasant refreshment after their work. Games were known in which several bishops took part.

In the summer there were scratch games of cricket, but they did not meet with so much approval as the hockey. Sometimes the Bishop took a fancy for croquet. He wanted an excuse for half an hour in the garden after a morning of letter-writing. He would turn out from his study with his college cap on his head, and call up to the school-room window for a child to come down and play croquet with him. But he was never an enthusiast for the game, and deserted it for the amusement of extracting plantains from the lawn. A spud was kept in a handy corner by his study door, and when his letters became too irritating, he would sally out to seek relief by attacking the plantains.

Visitors at the Palace will remember the way in which he used to come out of his study in search of a little refreshment; it seemed as if he wanted some humanising influence in the midst of all the puzzles of diocesan administration. He did not want to talk about his work, but to throw it off,

and the way in which he would linger in talk with any congenial person gave an impression of leisure unusual in the life of a busy man. One friend remembers how, after having returned late one night after a busy day in London, he was able to spend an hour and a half in the drawing-room next morning discussing the marriage laws, giving the impression that he had nothing particular to do. Yet he notes in his engagement book that during the first eight months of his episcopate he gave 115 sermons and speeches.

He began at once a plan which was carried out whenever possible, of inviting parties of his clergy with their wives and daughters, to the Palace for a couple of days. He liked to bring together in this way clergy from different parts, so as to increase the brotherly feeling throughout the diocese. These visits were arranged for days when he was free to stay at home and attend to his guests. His only regret was that he was so much away that he could not invite people as often as he wished. But the personal attention he paid to all who came was such as to make them feel that they were asked in no perfunctory way, nor left to entertain one another, but that they came to see the Bishop himself. Those who came to see him on business were asked to stay to lunch or tea, and there were unexpected inroads after committees when our children had to fly from the table to make room for the guests brought in by their father.

The laity in the diocese were invited to stay at the Palace over Sunday, so that they might have the pleasure of the Cathedral services. But, though we had frequent large Sunday gatherings, they were not allowed to interfere with the regular arrangements for the day nor to be a burden to the household. The plan carried out without interruption since our marriage, that there should be no cooking and no regular late dinner on Sundays, still prevailed. He said that if people did not like our ways they need not come. But he did not wish any guest to feel compulsion to go to church because he was in a bishop's house, and everyone was made to feel that he was at liberty to do as he liked.

The Palace was used for meetings and gatherings of every kind. The Abbot's Hall was most suitable for this purpose, and was willingly granted for any good object, with the in-

evitable tea afterwards. Amongst the larger gatherings of the year was the Conference of Rural Deans, who always stayed for a whole day and night. They had to be scattered for the night in the precincts and throughout the town, but between forty and fifty had their meals, and spent the day at the Palace. Garden parties were given in the summer, and to the last the Bishop was ever trying to discover new ways in which the Palace could be made useful to the Diocese. To bring people to Peterborough was to make them interested in the Cathedral, and helped them to feel it, what he wished to make it, the centre of diocesan life.

In the Holy Week of 1892 he undertook the daily addresses in the Cathedral, taking as his subject the chief actors in the great drama of the Crucifixion, the Chief Priests, Judas, Pontius Pilate and the Multitude. On Good Friday he conducted the meditations of the Three Hours' Service which was held that year for the first time in Peterborough Cathedral.

The spring was taken up with Confirmations, Convocation and other London meetings. His visits to London were always fugitive. He did not like London, and never cared to stay there longer than necessary. But the requests for sermons and lectures constantly increased. Once a year he used to address the Travellers' Club at Toynbee Hall in preparation for their journeys to Italy. He helped them to plan their tours and suggested places to visit that they would never have thought of without him. Then he gave them an historical lecture to prepare them for what they were to see, 'which,' says a member of the Club, 'would have been little to us but for those wonderful lectures of his; it is impossible to give an idea of the stream of light which flowed from them.'

On May 22 he preached at the Temple Church, and with reference to the coming election chose as his subject 'Religion and Politics.'¹ He said that it was sad that an election should be regarded as a calamity and as certain to stir up ill will and animosity, and showed how it might instead be used as a means of education. 'A politician is not merely an official of the people, he is an educator of the people.' 'In a democratic state, politics are necessarily a mighty means of popular education, and every man who takes part in them

¹ Published in *The Heritage of the Spirit*. Sampson Low.

should do so with the spirit of a teacher.' 'He is the truest patriot who proclaims that he would rather see the second-best way triumph by worthy means, than secure the victory of the best way by unworthy means.' 'In no capacity in life so much as in politics is a man's character immediately influential apart from the things which he does.' 'We need a more conscious and deliberate application of the principles of Christian morality to every department of life. It is not wholesome that the region of political life should be regarded as dubious.'

After the Trinity Ordination we went with our two eldest daughters for a fortnight to the Rhine district. Amongst other places we visited the little lake of Laach, which lies in a curious volcanic district, and has a fine Benedictine Abbey on its shores. As we drove to Laach he read to us out of the guidebook strange tales as to the volcanic fumes which at times come out of cracks and holes in the earth, so that poisoned rats and mice are sometimes found lying under banks or in caves. The next day we started to walk round the lake, a distance of about six miles, the way lying through thick woods. We were overtaken by a thunderstorm, and as we were sheltering under the trees, a peasant girl came hurriedly along the path and asked the way to the nearest village. Noticing her troubled look when we told her that we were strangers, and could not direct her, we asked what was the matter. She said that her sweetheart had fallen down and she was afraid he must be hurt, as she could not make him answer. We bade her lead us to the spot, and followed her to a deserted building on the edge of the lake, used formerly by a seminary in the neighbourhood as a place of holiday resort. Telling our daughters to wait for us, we followed her to a flight of ruined area steps, leading to the basement of the building. She pointed to an opening at the bottom, and said that her companion had gone down there to shelter from the rain, whilst she stood under their solitary umbrella, and that when, after waiting a quarter of an hour, she called to him, she could get no answer. Looking down the opening and through the hole at the bottom, we could see the dim form and white face of a man in the darkness below. My husband went down the broken steps, and fortunately remembering the guidebook tales of volcanic fumes, put his head in

cautiously. He withdrew it at once, saying, 'I cannot breathe there.' As he stood an instant thinking, I could not refrain from imploring him not to try to go in. But he answered at once, 'It is impossible to leave a fellow-creature to perish there.' He bade me catch hold of the belt of his Norfolk jacket and be ready to give a pull when necessary. Then first filling his lungs with fresh air, he made a plunge into the cellar, holding his breath, and tugged the man as far as he could, and then threw himself back to get some more fresh air. This was repeated several times, whilst I helped as well as I could by pulling from behind. At last he got the man to the opening, and we dragged him up the broken steps, and laid him on the wet grass with his head in my lap, whilst the poor girl stood bewildered and helpless watching us. We sent our daughters to get aid from the inn, but as we were just half way round the lake, they had to run three miles through the rain, breathless and exhausted, thinking that delay might mean loss of life. Meanwhile in the sodden forest, under the drip of the rain through the trees, we tried to bring back life to the inanimate form. But the feelings of thankfulness at having been allowed to save a human being's life were soon changed to disappointment. All our efforts to induce artificial respiration were in vain. It was a comfort afterwards to be told by a doctor that nothing could have restored the man, the deadly fumes of the carbonic acid gas must have done their work before he was got out of the cellar. But for nearly an hour we continued our useless efforts, and then had to give in. My husband watched at the edge of the lake for the boat which he expected would be sent from the inn; the poor girl and I waited by the body. She was confused and stupefied; the one thing that seemed to trouble her was how she was to get home to her own village that night. They had come by train to Laach to walk by the lake. At her feet lay the little bunch of wild strawberries which they had gathered and tied up together during the happy beginning of their walk. Cold and wet we waited; she knelt with me whilst I prayed for her, but my words seemed hardly to penetrate her mind; hers was a dull, unattractive face, and the strangeness of what had happened, the unknown nature of the foreigners who had tried to help her, made her feel

only utterly bewildered. At last a boat was seen approaching, sent from the inn after our daughters' arrival. The men who came in it refused to move the body, saying it must stay as it was till the authorities removed it. So we covered the white face with a handkerchief, the girl got into the boat, voluble now that she was with people of her own kind, and we, refusing to be rowed across, set off to walk back in order to get warm after the chill watching.

At the inn of course we were greeted with many questions ; but the occurrence was not considered surprising. No one who knew the district would have gone anywhere below the surface of the earth in such thundery weather. The landlord said that there were parts of his cellars into which he never went during a thunderstorm. We were afraid lest we might be delayed to give evidence, but the place was so remote that things moved easily. The Burgomaster came in whilst we were at supper, and asked a few questions, and next morning we left by train without any difficulty. Both at the inn that evening and at the station next morning my husband was treated as a hero. One man after another asserted that he would never have dared to try to get the man out, and many were the strange stories told us of accidents resulting from these volcanic fumes.

By the middle of June we were back at Peterborough, and in July we went over to Dublin for the Tercentenary of Trinity College. This was the Bishop's only visit to Ireland. We were the guests of Dr. Salmon, the venerable Provost of Trinity College, and were much interested by the succession of brilliant spectacles with which the occasion was celebrated ; they culminated in a garden party at the Viceregal lodge, to which many of the distinguished guests, in their magnificent academic robes, drove in Irish cars, amidst the cheers and admiration of the people of Dublin. The Bishop, together with many other representatives of learning, received an Hon. Degree and became LL.D. of Trinity College. The Sunday after the Commemoration we spent at Birr Castle with Lord and Lady Rosse, and were shown the famous telescope ; and the Bishop preached in the church at Parsonstown. The next week he was back at Peterborough travelling about the diocese, preaching, confirming and presiding at the prize

givings of various schools. He was especially welcome on these occasions, for his speeches¹ were not only stimulating to all interested in education, but he could amuse and keep the attention of the boys. On Sunday, August 7, he preached at Oxford to the summer gathering of University Extension Students,² and then read a paper on the Fenland to the Archæological Congress at Cambridge.³

During this and other summers he visited as many of his country parishes as possible, and spent Sundays in preaching in country villages, sometimes two, sometimes even three, sermons in the day. One of his clergy writes, 'He was the most delightful guest possible, entering into the family life, enjoying every subject of conversation, and always taking us up some bypath of knowledge which led to clearer judgment, without humiliating anyone. How late we used to sit up at night listening to him as he talked of subjects that no one else present knew much about! And yet he put us on terms of equality, and never seemed to know that we were less at home with the subject than he. I remember fascinating talks about ancient Spanish literature, the Flemish School of painting, the Vaudois, British birds.'

As many August days as possible he spent at home, so as to see something of his boys during their holidays, and he was able to do a little work at the fifth volume of the 'History of the Papacy.' Many friends visited us this summer, amongst others President and Mrs. Gilman from the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, and the Count and Countess Balzani from Rome.

The Diocesan Conference was held at Northampton in the end of September. The chief part of the Bishop's opening address was devoted to the subject of Church schools, and he spoke of the importance of defining terms and really knowing what was under discussion. He alluded to the outcry for popular control over Voluntary schools, and said 'a little thought will show you that at present the control of all State-aided schools rests absolutely with the Education Department. . . . the actual powers of the managers are so

¹ Some of them have been published in *Thoughts on Education*.

² Printed in *Thoughts on Education*.

³ Reprinted in *Historical Essays and Reviews*.

limited that it seems to me useless to discuss, as a matter of principle, who are the persons who are to exercise them. . . . The only power of any importance that rests with the Board of Management is to determine the nature of the religious education which is to be given.'

The week finished with five special functions, church openings or dedications, and then he went to Folkestone for the Church Congress, where he preached one of the opening sermons, read a paper on Christian Ethics,¹ and addressed meetings of working men and working women. As soon as the Congress was over we started for Italy. Three days after he had spoken to the working men at Folkestone, we were walking over the lovely promontory of Porto Fino on the Eastern Riviera, and lunching off an omelet at a roadside inn. He wrote to a friend that evening, 'We are perfectly revelling in Italy; it is too nice for words.'

On this journey he made a study of Etruscan cities, and read to help him G. Dennis' great work which he carried with him as a guidebook. At Volterra and Corneto he was captivated by the strange interest of the Etruscan tombs and the wonderful riches of the local museums. After a few days in Rome with the Balzanis we carried off Count Balzani to Viterbo.

Viterbo delighted the Bishop. We spent a day of intermittent rain in making the circuit of its ruined walls, during which he repeatedly declared there was nothing he liked better in the world than exploring old walls.

To Count Ugo Balzani

'Cortona: October 27, 1892.

'Dear Balzani,—After we had recovered from the shock of your departure from Viterbo, we took your driver to Castel d'Asso, which was amazingly interesting. In a lonely ravine like that which goes round Ronciglione, we found an Etruscan cemetery, of tombs with façades sculptured in the rock. Only a peasant's hut and a ruined medieval castle marked the headland; round it flowed a stream, and the whole semicircle of rock beyond was crowned with crumbling sculptures of a simple architectural sort. Then we visited Bulicame,² a

¹ Published in *The Church and the Nation*.

² He felt a special interest in visiting this hot spring because it is mentioned by Dante in the *Inferno*, Canto xiv. p. 79.

sulphurous fountain which comes up boiling on a desert plain and petrifies everything on its banks. Next day we had a lovely drive to Orvieto. The view of the Lake of Bolsena from Montefiascone was splendid, and I found at Montefiascone a Romanesque church more beautiful even than those at Viterbo. At Orvieto we visited some painted Etruscan tombs, most interesting, with pictures of a butcher's and a baker's shop exactly like those of to-day, yet probably 700 B.C. At Perugia we found quite another kind of Etruscan tomb, with magnificent carvings on the roof, of palatial size and splendour. To-day we drove from Perugia here, along Lake Trasimeno, all along the site of the battlefield, which is most intelligible at a glance. I have improved my mind enormously, but pine to return to Viterbo and see Norchia, Bieda, Toscanella, and the despised Civit  Castellana. I found an Englishman at Perugia who had been everywhere. I was at first disgusted, because he had been to more places than I had, but, on talking to my landlady, I found that he was preparing a new edition of Murray's Guide. He said that Toscanella had architecture of surpassing beauty, that Civit  was one of the most beautiful places in Italy, and that the view from Soracte was superb.

'As you were interested about the milestones about Viterbo, I must tell you that coming from Perugia to-day we went by kilometres till we entered Tuscany; then the milestones counted by miles from Florence. I asked my driver, and he said it was so in Tuscany, not in Umbria. I noticed that he had a longing for Tuscany, and regarded it as a much richer land than Umbria. Alas, our journey is coming rapidly to an end, but it has been a most delightful and fruitful one, thanks greatly to you.'

We were absent from England for five weeks. On his return home, the Bishop had to preach before the University of Cambridge the annual sermon in Commemoration of Founders and Benefactors. This sermon had been written in spare moments during his holiday. He took as his text 'My heart within me is desolate : I remember the days of old ; I meditate on all Thy doings,' and spoke of the influence exercised by the University through the temper of mind which prevailed in it, bred of the unwearied pursuit of truth and the sincere love of knowledge of long generations of students, many of whom were obscure and unknown, mere names recited year after year on the long list of benefactors.¹

¹ This sermon is printed in *University and other Sermons*.

From Cambridge he went to Ely for the gathering of East Anglian Bishops. It was the custom that the Bishops of Lincoln, Norwich, Peterborough, Ely, and St. Albans should spend two days together once a year, each taking it in his turn to entertain the others and their wives. The time was spent partly in discussing matters connected with their work as bishops, partly in social intercourse. The Bishop's share in these discussions, and the way he viewed some of the questions brought forward, are thus described by Dr. Festing (the late Bishop of St. Albans) :

‘What struck me from the first, and always, was the way he always gave us his best. He never bottled up things for an audience. It was the subject that possessed him, not the effect *he* might produce. If anything he was more thorough, to my mind, in our little East Anglian conclave than in a larger assembly. But in small or great meetings, or in private conversation, there was always the lifting the subject on to a higher mental level. We got to principles, to wide views; we left mere details, or rather, for he never forgot their working value, details were not allowed to be *the* thing, nor were rules and regulations. . . . As a bishop he seemed to think much of the duty of a bishop with regard to the corporate life, the history of the Church, the position of the Church as a body in the world—and, the bishop was to rule, but it was to be the rule of knowledge and thought, not of arbitrary will, so he wanted time in dealing with men and things. . . . As to his dealings with clergy and more generally, it seemed to me he had great sympathy with the tempted. He was sorry for them, and though discipline was exercised, he was anxious to open the door to a penitent, so that a man might get back again if possible. He had hopes about the possibility of repentance, and hopes that in every man's character there is a generous bit which may be touched by generous treatment and so the man might be lifted up. Connected with this, perhaps, was his very deep feeling about the possibilities of the love of God, and the superiority of love over mere correctness of conduct. He was good at business, perhaps a little scornful at times in dealing with men not so quick at seeing things as he was. Business seemed to him to be justice and righteousness in action. He was very good and kind in our private discussions, never scornful, never trying to score off our ignorance or dulness. But at times he started a theory (so I got to think) rather for the purpose

of seeing how people would take it and so getting light upon the subject. It helped his thought.'

After the Ely meeting came the autumn visit to Leicester, during which he went up every week to lecture in London at St. Paul's Cathedral on 'the Friars.'¹ These lectures were given with only the help of the briefest notes, and showed, as a critic observed, how steeped he was in medieval history. A Roman Catholic newspaper remarked that: 'no son of St. Dominic could have sketched with greater tenderness the portrait of his spiritual ancestor.'

It would be impossible to mention all the different lectures he gave during this winter. As usual he shared with others the impressions gathered during his holidays by lecturing at Peterborough on 'the Cities of Etruria.' In Lent he gave a course of addresses in the Cathedral on 'Some Holy Men of Old,' beginning with St. Guthlac, and ending with John Wesley. He also gave a series of lectures to the Leicester clergy on the 'History of Indulgences,' and repeated them in Peterborough and Northampton. Besides these, he gave many separate lectures in different parts of the Diocese and elsewhere. Mr. Grose Hodge writes that his lectures 'were very largely attended, and many nonconformist ministers sat side by side with Anglicans of every type, listening to the clear, unadorned English to which the Bishop rigidly kept himself on these occasions. "Knowledge," he used to say, "is the solution of most difficulties even amongst the clergy. It is only ignorance that is intolerant."'

In the spring of 1893, the Welsh Suspensory Bill was introduced into the House of Commons. At the Bishop's request, meetings were held in all his Rural Deaneries to protest against the Bill. He himself presided and spoke at a crowded and enthusiastic meeting in the Drill Hall at Peterborough. He said that he spoke that evening as a citizen, not as a bishop, and that as a citizen he objected to the Bill; it was the first step towards disestablishment, and it was as an Englishman that he objected to disestablishment. 'It is one of the proud boasts of Englishmen at present that they can say that they are Englishmen first, and that nothing

¹ These lectures have been published in *Lectures and Addresses*.



For everything
W. Peteburg.

stands between them and allegiance to their country. But it will be very different if the Church of England is disestablished; then there will be many who will be constrained to say that they are Churchmen first and only Englishmen afterwards.'

This year we went for our holiday in June, immediately after the Trinity Ordination. The Bishop had been reading Mr. Samuel Butler's enchanting book 'Alps and Sanctuaries' and determined to visit some of the places there described. We divided our time between the Italian lakes and the lower slopes of the Alps, and explored many mountain sanctuaries.

To his daughter Lucia

'Monte Generoso : June 13, 1893.

' After sitting last night in the garden of an Italian villa it is odd now to be shivering with one's great-coat on, and all the windows shut in the room of a ridiculous new Swiss hotel. . . . Twice we have dropped down into places where English gather, once at Baveno and once at Varese. The English consisted of a few men, a few old ladies and hosts of girls. I have been looking at these girls with despair. They do nothing : they know nothing : they don't go and see anything. They sit and gossip ; then they read drivelling novels from the library : they sit in the garden or have a row on the lake or have a drive anywhere. But they know nothing of the interesting things to be seen and care less. I went to Varese to see a most interesting Sanctuary about five miles off, with a series of chapels reaching up the hill. There were about sixty people in the hotel : many of them had been staying there for months : I do not think that any one of them knew that there was such a place, or had any intention of seeing it. They drove by the lake or potted in the town whenever they tore themselves from gossip in the garden. Really such people ought not to be allowed to travel. It is quite terrible to see what English girls become when left to themselves. They were quite nice ; quite amiable and doubtless virtuous, but perfectly empty. Why did not they stay at home and play lawn tennis ? What was the good of their travelling ? The spectacle of so many English girls has filled me with terror. Don't be like them ; have some object in life. The sight of people without an object has quite overcome me : at home people profess to be doing something ; but when they travel their imbecility becomes apparent. There ; I have grumbled enough.'

As a result of this journey the Bishop got to know Mr. S. Butler. He wrote to tell him the pleasure his books had given us, and asked him to visit us. After this he came frequently, and the Bishop was much attracted by his original mind and stores of out-of-the-way knowledge.

July was filled with a variety of diocesan work. He had his annual gathering of Rural Deans, assisted at the diocesan retreat, took a quiet day for school teachers, preached at Lichfield Cathedral to a gathering of Sunday school teachers, went to the Conference of Clergy held at Oxford, where he spoke at one of their meetings and preached to them. He was at Lincoln to preach the hospital sermon in the Cathedral, and at Marlborough to preach to the boys and speak at the prize-day luncheon. These engagements for one month, in addition to the ordinary work of consecrating cemeteries, instituting clergy, opening churches, presiding at meetings, and carrying on all the business of the Diocese, will give some idea of the nature of his life. To follow all his various engagements would be impossible.

In the autumn he attended the Birmingham Church Congress, and was glad to find himself again amongst the old friends of his Worcester days. He spoke at the Congress on 'Science and Faith.' Writing to Mr. Cruttwell, he says of this speech: 'I am glad that you approve of my desperate attempt to condense a treatise into a quarter of an hour's speech.' He showed that natural science could not give men all the knowledge which they needed.

'The fact that man has the power of asking questions which transcend the natural order is a fact to be accounted for. . . . Faith also appeals to facts, the facts of consciousness. It is not concerned with idle speculations. Man sets the problem to which faith supplies the answer. . . . It will be said that this answer is not universally accepted. I reply that the experience to which faith appeals is not universal; and men may fail, or may refuse, to gain it. It is so in a still greater degree with science. The experience on which any branch of knowledge is founded is a matter for experts, and the vast majority of mankind enjoy the results of science without any care for the principles on which they rest. . . . If a man said "I think nothing of chemistry. . . . I once looked into it, but its method was too abstruse and its procedure too round-

about for a plain man like myself," we should tell him that his ignorance was pardonable, but that the attitude of ignorance towards knowledge should be respectful and not contemptuous. . . . Faith must always be subject to criticism, relevant and irrelevant. But the verification of its hypotheses must come from those who approach its subject matter, *i.e.* God, in the same patient and watchful spirit as the man of science approaches the subject of his study. . . . God working in nature according to His own purposes, this is to a believer the revelation of science. But man is endowed with powers, which rise above the natural order and enable him to stand in conscious relationship with God. It is in accordance with all that science shows us of natural processes that this relationship should be the object of a gradual revelation. . . . We murmur at difficulties, at slow progress, at apparent waste, at misery which we long to remedy, but are powerless. Nature at least may teach us to combine patience with effort, and trust in the harmony of heaven.'

He also spoke at Coventry to a working-men's meeting in connexion with the Congress and preached the closing sermon in Worcester Cathedral.

In this sermon, after speaking of the lessons of the Congress, he stated what to him was the meaning of the English Church :

'We tend, I think, to make too many apologies for the supposed defects of the Church of England ; its want of discipline ; its absence of positive definition on many points ; its large latitude of opinion. To me it seems that the Church of England is the only religious organisation which faces the world as it is, which recognises the actual facts, and works for God, in God's own way. . . . The Church of England is rigid in maintaining necessary truth, and is careful to draw the line between what is necessary and what is matter for expediency. . . . I trust that the time is past when anyone wishes, for uniformity's sake, to narrow the limits of the English Church. . . . Its proudest boast is that it faces the world as it is, and faces it simply and straightforwardly. It has no reservations, nothing which it need explain away. The treasures of the past history of the Church are open to its children, and they are free to adapt them to the needs of their souls, provided they do not enforce as obligatory what has been deliberately left to the responsibility of the individual. The aspirations and ideas of the present, in politics, in science, in thought, have no terrors for the Church of England, for its

hold of vital truth has never been encumbered by the rubbish of falling scaffoldings and tottering buttresses, which threaten to drag the main building into ruin. The Church of England faces the world as it is, knowing that the world-spirit is strong and operative in many forms, resolute in maintaining God's truth. But it draws a clear line between God's truth and man's means of expressing it, however noble and beautiful they may be. God's truth set forth in accordance with primitive practice, that is the position of the English Church.¹

During this year, in the intervals of his life of external activity, he was occupied in seeing his new volume of the 'History of the Papacy' through the press. He had found it difficult to get time for the finishing touches.

To Mr. C. J. Longman

'February 25, 1893.

'I will send you very shortly the MS. of another volume of my "Papacy." It will be a long time before I trouble you with any more.'

He did not yet quite give up hope of carrying his book further; but each year the chance grew less. On November 7, 1896 he wrote to Mr. Longman, 'I fear that my history will remain where it is. Luckily 1527 is a sort of epoch, which marks the end of the Renaissance Papacy, and the book has a consistency as it is.'

In the next volume, according to his original idea, he would have treated the Reformation in England, and some pages of the first chapter on the divorce of Henry VIII. were written before he was obliged to abandon all hope of continuing his work.

The fifth volume of the 'History of the Papacy' deals with the beginnings of Luther's career. It contains a study of German humanism, and a careful investigation into the history and use of indulgences. It ends with the sack of Rome. With the central figure of his drama, Luther himself, the Bishop was not much in sympathy. He was to him an astounding phenomenon, an extraordinary force, without whom probably reformation would have been impossible, but Erasmus was far more congenial to him. His work stopped before he could say his final word about Luther.

¹ This sermon is published in *University and other Sermons*.

Dr. Gore (now Bishop of Worcester) wrote to him about the book; 'I have just been reading the last volume of your Popes, with great gratitude for "the spirit of judgment."' The following letters also refer to this volume :

To Mr. H. C. Lea

'June 16, 1894.

'Thank you very much for your notice of my last volume in "The New World." It is rare to be reviewed by anyone who knows anything of the subject. I quite agree with your criticisms, as I know too well my own limitations. My method is, to take up questions as they present themselves, and to view them as they might have presented themselves to an intelligent member of the Curia. I try to take the view of a contemporary statesman, who was not a philosopher, or a thinker, but merely a man of affairs. I try to find out how he acted on the evidence before him. Thus I have introduced nothing into my examination of German humanism which had not come before the Curia in the Reuchlin contest. I don't hold Leo X. responsible for a knowledge of the tendencies of theological thought. These are discovered afterwards, by reflection after the event. In the same way I looked at Hergenröther, but quailed before the labour of an account of the actual grievances of Germany. I had indicated them before, in dealing with the Concordat with Frederick III.; they were no heavier than they had been. Anyhow it seemed to me that an account of them could only be undertaken as a separate work, dealing with papal aggression as a whole. I incline to think that the future of historical writing is on your lines. The study of institutions in detail must be done before general results can be summarised. The history of the future will be less concerned with facts and more with internal development. We are only preparing the way.

'I have lately come across a document which would interest you, about Indulgences. It is in a huge Italian work in three volumes, "*Caterina Sforza*," by Count Pasolini. The book as a whole would not interest you, but there is a curious document from Bona of Savoy, who wishes to make amends for the evil life of her husband, Gian Galeazzo Sforza, who was assassinated. She accordingly prepared a case for the opinion of the Sorbonne, as to how she could merit his deliverance from Purgatory. The answer of the Sorbonne recognises almost unlimited power of obtaining indulgences for another. If you would like this, I will have it copied and send it to you.'

To Professor Kolde (the distinguished German biographer of Luther).
(Translated from the German)

‘October 5, 1894.

‘I should like to express my gratitude for your review of my last volume of the “History of the Papacy” in the “*Deutsche Literatur-Zeitung*.” I have learnt so much from your books that I am glad to read your opinion of my treatment of Luther. My point of view is restricted and somewhat abstract. In my opinion Luther’s personality is the hardest to understand as a whole in all my period. As a man, as a German, as the leader of a party, as a statesman, as a reformer, in each of these characters taken alone he is tolerably clear. But to connect all his sides with the ideas of the time, and give them their proper importance in the history of the world (*weltgeschichtliche Bedeutung*), that I feel to be impossible. I have only tried to discover something about his attitude to the idea of a united Christendom. What I have written does not satisfy me myself. It could not satisfy a German. That you have not judged me severely is a mark of your kindness.’

Dr. Kolde in his answer spoke of his admiration for the Bishop’s ‘great and beautiful work.’ He described it as built up on a foundation of original research which gathered together the results of the great literature of monographs, and treated them from a universal point of view. But his admiration naturally did not keep him from differing in many points from the Bishop’s conclusions. The conception of the whole book led to its author treating Luther mainly from his political side. Dr. Kolde said that amongst German students the conviction had grown increasingly strong that Luther could only be adequately understood from the religious side. To this the Bishop answered :

‘Peterborough : November 15, 1894.

‘My dear Dr. Kolde,—I am very much obliged to you for your letter, with every word of which I cordially agree. I have said somewhere in my book that “Luther had a genius for religion.” He was not a theologian, nor was he a statesman. But the misfortune is that, in times of revolution and change, a man is driven to be a theologian and a statesman against his will, and must be judged as such. My point of view is that it was a misfortune for Christendom that the Reformation took the form of a breach of unity of the Church. All would agree on this, but we Protestants would say

that it was inevitable. By this it is generally meant that there were contradictory tendencies of thought which necessitated opposite forms of expression. I do not think so. I do not think that any breach was inevitable. The question is whose fault was it? I have investigated this question as I would investigate any political secession. I have regarded it as a question of governmental wisdom and justice. I have tried to show that the Papacy behaved towards Luther both foolishly and unjustly at first. Luther made no demands which the Church ought not to have been able to supply, according to its own principles. The Curia was responsible for driving Luther to revolt. It must be judged by its fidelity to its principles, and it was not faithful. This is the point which I have tried to bring into prominence. It is not a point which interests many people; most people would think that it was not worth considering. We are so accustomed to the idea of a divided Church that we do not stop to consider how it arose, or who was responsible for it. It may be quite true that the Roman system was opposed to liberty, but this must be made good in the particular facts.

‘Great as is my admiration for Luther as a religious teacher, I am still more impressed by him as a popular leader. He had all the qualities for such a post—quick sympathy with the average man, a capacity for picking up what was in the air and expressing it forcibly. This to me accounts for his defects; he was a man of his own time and race; he has to be understood among his surroundings. But it is useless for me to write at length on points about which you know so much more than I do. I cannot refrain from saying that amongst German writers on the subject I found your works far the best.

To Dr. Richard Garnett

‘Leicester: November 24, 1894.

‘Your letter was forwarded to me at Leicester, where I am staying in lodgings, and I am engaged from morning to night with meetings and interviews and speeches. Hence my delay. . . . Your mention of the articles against Morone makes me wish that I could ever look forward to writing any more history. Alas, the chances seem to fade away; I have very little hope of any more continuous work. I may be able to do something, but I think it will have to be on a smaller scale, and of a slighter character. I have just been having a most amiable correspondence with Kolde about my view of Luther. He practically agrees with me and writes that: “Luther in erster Linie als religiöse Natur zu begreifen ist. Seine Beurtheilung der Dinge auch der politischen ist immer

die religiöse, daher die relative Beschränktheit seines Blickes in diesen Fragen . . . Er war viel weniger Theologe als man gewöhnlich annimmt." ¹

'I never thought to get so much out of a German.'

To the same

'January 1, 1895.

'Thanks for calling my attention to Symonds' criticism of my book ; it is very gratifying. But I see that he feels a pang at parting with the idea that the Reformation sprang from the scandals of the Roman Court. I have tried to show that the revolt against the Papacy was like any other revolt ; it was against power oppressively exercised, contrary to the popular wish and the popular sense of justice. . . .

'If you have looked at my last volume you may have guessed that the question I have before me is, not—"Why did the Reformation come?" that is obvious—but—"Why did the old remain, why was it not swept away?"

'The thing that needs apology is the weakness of the Reformation. Surely to explain this we must get to my position (which is also Kolde's), that it was led by a man who was neither a statesman nor a theologian.'

The correspondence with Dr. Kolde led to a visit from him when he came to England in the following year. He says that the opportunities he then enjoyed of discussing important historical problems with Dr. Creighton belong to the most precious recollections of his life.

In the winter of 1893 to 1894 the Bishop gave the Hulsean Lectures at Cambridge. He chose as his subject 'Persecution and Tolerance.' Though he called the lectures when published nothing more than 'a trifling contribution to a great subject,' those who wish to understand his mind will find it perhaps more clearly expressed in them than in any other of his writings. They give the results of his learning, they show the principles on which his judgments were formed, they tell what he meant by religious liberty, they explain the temper in which he approached the opinions of others. I will quote only his description of the tolerant man :

'The tolerant man has decided opinions, but recognises

¹ 'Luther is in the first place to be understood from the religious side. He judges everything, even on political matters, always from the religious point of view ; hence the comparative narrowness of his outlook in these questions. . . . He was much less of a theologian than is generally recognised.

the process by which he reached them, and keeps before himself the truth that they can only be profitably spread by repeating in the case of others a similar process to that through which he passed himself. He always keeps in view the hope of spreading his own opinions, but he endeavours to do so by producing conviction. He is virtuous, not because he puts his own opinions out of sight, nor because he thinks that other opinions are as good as his own, but because his opinions are so real to him that he would not have anyone else hold them with less reality.

‘Tolerance is needful to the individual; for it is the expression of that reverence for others which forms a great part of the lesson which Christ came to teach him. It is the means whereby he learns to curb self-conceit, and submit to the penetrating discipline imposed by Christian love.’

His concluding words explain the spirit in which he faced the problems that confronted him later in London :

‘There is always a temptation to the possessors of power—be they an individual, an institution, or a class—to use it selfishly or harshly. Liberty is a tender plant and needs jealous watching. It is always unsafe in the world, and is only secure under the guardianship of the Church; for the Church possesses the knowledge of man’s eternal destiny—which alone can justify his claim to freedom.’

Lady Jebb remembers that she heard Dr. Peile, the Master of Christ’s College, say, after the third Hulsean Lecture, ‘I have not heard a sermon like that for twenty-five years;’ to which she rejoined, ‘I have never heard a sermon like that in England.’ Whilst Prince Edward of Saxe-Weimar said, ‘I don’t call that a sermon, but an essay,’ and Colonel Caldwell, ‘It was too deep for me; I went to sleep.’

The lectures were afterwards published.

To Mr. C. J. Longman

‘May 18, 1894.

‘People have been asking me about my Hulsean lectures. They seemed to excite some interest. I send them to you as they were delivered. If you would have them set up in slips, I would perhaps add footnotes. I will also write an introduction, and probably an appendix. But I think the body of the book had better be the lectures as they were given.’

To Mr. H. C. Lea

‘June 16, 1894.

‘I am just about to publish some lectures which I gave at Cambridge lately, on “Persecution.” My position is that persecution is not necessarily inherent in the conception of a Church, but is inherent in the possession of power. I therefore traverse some of your conclusions in your “Inquisition” and regard the Church when vested with coercive power, not as a religious body, but as a branch of secular institutions. I will send you the book when it appears. It is very slight and superficial, but is meant to plead for a reconsideration of current judgment on the whole question.’

To Mrs. J. R. Green

‘Peterborough: June 10, 1895.

‘I have already forgotten all about my book. My copies were sent out late, because I was in Italy when it came out, and Longman had not told me of its issue.

‘I quite agree with you that man’s right to freedom of opinion is hard to maintain in the face of the claims of society on the individual. My only point is that persecution is not inherent in religious opinions more than in any other set of opinions which are taken as the basis of common life. All I urge is that these things should be considered separately. Christianity in itself as a system of thought and practice is one thing. Christianity as the necessary basis for common life is another. It was regarded in the ages of persecution as this necessary basis. Its persecuting activity arose from a cause which now no longer exists. It is certainly an open question, if any set of opinions again become equally regarded as necessary, whether or no persecution would revive. If tolerance is a virtue, it is only because Christianity has learned to regard it so—if indeed it has so learned. Any other set of opinions—*e.g.* those of “naturalism”—would be more intolerant if they were predominant.’

When criticised in 1900 for the way in which he ruled, or, as his critic thought, neglected to rule, his clergy, he referred to this book as showing that he was only acting in accordance with opinions that had long been his, the fruit of his study of men in life and history.

After the last Hulsean lecture, on February 11, 1894, we started for Algeria. He had found that the spring and early summer months suited his country parishes best for Confirmations, and thought therefore that a winter holiday might best fit in with his work. It was not easy for him to decide

to desert Italy, but he longed for warmth, and so we went as quickly as possible to Constantine, which much impressed him. Then, after visiting the ruined city of Timegad, we spent a couple of days with the Alfred Peases at Biskra, and went to Tunis. On our way we stopped at Hammam Meskoutine, and he enjoyed few things more than a long walk from there over the hills covered with magnificent woods of cork and wild olive to the remains of the wonderful Roman fortress Announa.

At Tunis he felt for the first time the charm of the East and enjoyed many rambles in the bazaar. But probably the day we spent at Carthage gave him the keenest impression of the whole journey. He got back to Peterborough in time to take the addresses on the evenings in Holy Week and the Three Hours service on Good Friday.

In May, he spoke at the Royal Academy dinner, and returned thanks for the guests. He was much amused at the effect produced by this speech. He was as yet little known to the great world of London, but it is no exaggeration to say that in one moment he found himself famous. Everyone spoke about the speech; he was more congratulated about it than about anything else in his life; and said, that he had now reached the pinnacle of fame; and that he could not hope to do anything more remarkable than to please and amuse such a critical audience as that at the Academy banquet. It is useless to attempt to give any idea of the speech from the reports of the press. It was his manner as much as his matter which gave it its success. The mixture of good-natured banter with real thought, the humour and the unexpected turns of phrase delivered with perfect ease, in tones that everyone could hear, made him one of the best after-dinner speakers of his day. He had probably spoken as well in many quiet corners of his diocese or even of his Northumbrian parish, but now London had found him out. In Archbishop Benson's diary there is the following entry about this dinner: 'Rosebery amusing, but by far the most amusing, and in a higher flight and full of sense, was the Bishop of Peterborough. Everybody came up to me afterwards to congratulate me.'

A success of this sort simply amused the Bishop. He

used to talk quite frankly in his family circle, or among his intimate friends, of his successes, speaking of them as if they were something outside himself. He would come in from a dinner or a meeting, and when we asked him how things had gone, he would say, 'Oh! I have been a success again;' or, with a little laugh, 'It is quite absurd; my speech was again the success of the evening.' There was no conceit in this; he claimed no credit for his gifts, but he was too clear-sighted not to be aware of the effect they produced, and too frank to pretend to ignore it. He said that when he had become well known, the pleasure of success was gone. It had amused him to surprise people who knew nothing about him, but when something out of the common was expected of him, nothing that he could say or do would astonish. As he once said in a sermon: 'Everything that we do, however well we do it, however much we be praised in the doing it, makes it more difficult to do something else. Success even more than failure forges for us a chain of habit, and robs us of the consciousness of freedom.'

In May a festival service was held at Peterborough to dedicate some splendid gifts made to the Cathedral, including a great organ, choir gates, and an altar canopy or baldachino of alabaster and mosaic. The Bishop had been convinced by his study of early Romanesque churches in Dalmatia and Rome that a baldachino was the most fitting adornment for an altar standing in an apse, as the altar in Peterborough Cathedral does. His suggestion that the proposed reredos should take this form was adopted, and the beautiful baldachino, the gift of the children of Dr. Saunders, a former dean, has proved a fine addition to the glory of the marble pavement and the rare dignity of the choir of the Cathedral.

The Bishop preached the sermon at the dedication festival, and spoke of the power of the 'imaginings of the thoughts of the heart' to ennoble life, and of the way in which a beautiful building expressed and stimulated these imaginations.¹ Speaking at the public luncheon afterwards, he said that the Cathedral had grown in the affections of the people of the diocese ever since they had learnt that its foundations were threatened. They had not rested content with doing

¹ The sermon is published in *University and other Sermons*.

the work necessary to maintain the fabric, but had gone on to beautify it by voluntary effort and personal sacrifice so as to make it fit for the service of God. He urged them to persevere and do the work still needed.

The time had come when he must hold a primary visitation of his Diocese. He had tried to think out some method of avoiding the ordinary visitation, but in vain.

To his Chancellor, Mr. G. H. Blakesley

‘Peterborough : April 6, 1894.

‘You cannot groan over the prospect of a visitation more than I do. I thought over all possible means, but nothing seemed satisfactory. The amount of formal business in admitting churchwardens is great, apparently some talk is requisite. But what to say is a problem still unsolved. I have sent *no* articles of inquiry to the clergy. I take their statistics from the “Church Year Book,” which supplies me with detailed information. But I have sent articles to the churchwardens, and my view is that I am always visiting my clergy, but that once in three years the churchwardens should feel that they can say their say to their Bishop.

‘That is the only theory I have, that of a safety-valve. I can always *nail* a discontented parish by saying : “Why did not your officer inform me, when I had the opportunity of investigating?”’

‘May 24, 1894.

‘Will you come here on Monday evening, so as to be ready for the hideous formality which we are to discharge on so many days? . . . I am very sorry for you. I hope you are equally sorry for me.’

He delivered the first portion of his Charge at Peterborough on May 29 and the remainder in six different churches in various centres of the Diocese. In this Charge he expresses his views on the current questions of the day—Disestablishment, the Welsh Bill, social problems, education, Biblical criticism, the Local Government Bill. As the Hulsean lectures reveal the temper of his mind, and the principles on which his life was founded, so does the Primary Charge show how he applied those principles to the questions of practical life. It makes clear what manner of man he was, more perhaps than anything else he ever wrote. It is equally full of humour, of learning, of common sense, of practical

wisdom, of deep spiritual insight. To give any idea of it from quotations would be impossible, those who would understand him must read it in full¹; but I give a few short sayings from it which are specially characteristic of him :

‘ Liberty is frequently regarded as if it were only a right ; but it is also a serious responsibility. The great question for the modern world to determine is how men are to be fitted to bear the heavy burden of liberty.’

‘ The great need of our day is that all human relationships should be first moralised and then spiritualised. For this great end we need not only good intentions, but knowledge and wisdom.’

‘ The whole question of discipline depends on the attitude of the teacher towards the children as human beings. There is in every lesson, no matter what the subject may be, a perpetual appeal, unconscious, I admit, but its effect is cumulative ; and the most important effect of any educational system is the general attitude towards life which it has inculcated.’

‘ The surest sign of social progress is increasing interest in the generation that is to come.’

‘ The strength of a clergyman’s position lies in the fact that he belongs to no class and to no party. It is his duty to consider only the general welfare, and seek out the principles on which it rests.’

‘ The service of man without the service of God becomes an intolerable burden. Hopefulness in the long run is only possible for one who prays.’

‘ No man should always harp upon one string ; all should have a resource within themselves which is sufficiently strong to prevent them from being entirely under the influence of their daily work.’

It is interesting to notice how he foreshadowed some provisions of the Education Bill of 1902 :

‘ I incline to think that our present system errs on the side of uniformity. . . . There is need for greater latitude of experiment. But any relaxation of central control in this respect is only possible if local interest be keen, and if there be an intelligent body to whom some measure of responsibility may be delegated. I could imagine a committee of the Town Council, or the District Council, which stood between the schools and the department ; but the existence

¹ The Charge has been reprinted in *The Church and the Nation*.

of such a body would probably presuppose more general interest in the nature and contents of education than already exists. To quicken such interest is a worthy object.'

In June he went to Oxford to receive the hon. degree of D.C.L. from his old University, an addition to his many academic distinctions which he much valued.

The chance reading of Mr. P. T. Forsythe's book 'Religion and Recent Art,' had given him a desire to go to the Wagner Festival at Bayreuth, and we went there at the end of July with his sister, our eldest daughter and Miss Dorothy Ward. He was much amused at the whole experience, and enjoyed the operas very much at the time. But the more he thought about Wagner, the more doubtful he became about the value of his art. He wrote to a niece who was staying at Dresden in 1900 :

'The attempt to make old legends tell all sorts of great truths by means of musical motives seems to me quite silly. If I want great truths, I do not find them expressed by music. Really Wagner's music is too exciting. The end of music is to soothe, to calm, to give repose. Wagner does the contrary. Many people have told me that his music always makes them feel wicked. I can understand what they mean. . . . I seem to be giving you a lecture on a subject which I imperfectly understand. Like Wagner as much as you like, but like other people also. . . . It was at Dresden in 1867 that I first got to know his music. . . . At that time Wagner was thought a lunatic; now he is adored, so wags the world. . . . The musical drama is impossible. Music may express feelings, but it cannot carry on action.'

His real love was for the old composers, Palestrina, Bach, Handel, and of course Beethoven. When he was at home in the evenings, he generally asked his daughter to sing to him, and though he enjoyed the more modern German songs, he was most pleased when she sang old Italian airs. It was not often that he could be persuaded to go to a concert, but when he did go he delighted in good orchestral or chamber music.

It was in this year that the Church Historical Society was founded. The idea originated with a few men in London, Dr. G. F. Browne (then Bishop of Stepney), Canon Gore, Canon Mason, the Rev. W. E. Collins and the Rev. S. Phillips.

The object of the society was to study special points touching the history and position of the Church of England, to spread information and to repel attacks. The Bishop was its first President, and he held that office till his death. He attended the first meeting in connexion with the society in September and always took much interest in its quiet and useful work. He spoke at its meetings, and allowed several of his papers on questions connected with Church history to be published by it.

In the autumn he went to Exeter for the Church Congress and preached in the Cathedral on the Sunday before the Congress. During the week he spoke at the Free and Open Church meeting, at a meeting for the Church House, opened a Home for Waifs and Strays, read a paper at the congress on 'Cathedrals in relation to the Cathedral City, the Diocese and the Church at large,' besides speaking to a great meeting of working men and women. This speech is a good example of his method on such occasions. He began with remarking that the kind of life he had to lead made him an observer of advertisements, and that he found it a help to be met at every turn by the wise remark 'Don't worry.' Then when he had got his audience into good temper with him, he told them that his object was to try to get them to think accurately about Church and State. He defined the State as 'the community which is concerned with the arrangements of the common life' and the Church as 'the community concerned with setting forth the principles on which all life rests.' 'Why should not Church and State exist side by side? For a long time they did and nobody thought of doubting the necessity of the arrangement, but then something was discovered that is called liberty. A good many people nowadays regard liberty as a kind of fad. I for my part think that liberty is the most valuable principle which has ever been discovered.' He showed how the Church could not apply liberty in the same way as did the State, which allowed the game of politics to be played like a game of cricket, the two sides taking turns to be in; the way which had been invented in order to maintain religious liberty was to have a national Church and, by the side of it, voluntary religious societies. He went on to treat of the objections to an Established

Church, and said that it would not do to point to the example of the colonies or America. 'We must stand by what we have inherited, and it would be the greatest blow to civilisation not only in England, but in Europe generally, if the ancient historic land of England abandoned its connexion with religion.' Then, as if he had been serious too long, he enlivened his audience with some anecdotes, and after answering various reasons given for severing the connexion between Church and State, he concluded by speaking of the life and the work of the clergy. 'Talk about an eight hours day. Why most of our town clergy regularly work far more than eight hours every day, they never cease from their work from the time they get up.' His last words were to the women, bidding them rise to a higher conception of their duties as citizens.

After the congress, he visited the Bishop of Truro and preached at St Austell's. Thence we went to Wells, and he addressed the Church-reading Society at Bath. In the following week he visited his brother at Carlisle. This was his first visit to his native city since he had been a bishop; his fellow-townsmen welcomed him with great pride, and he preached in the Cathedral to a crowded congregation. We went next to Newcastle, where he spoke at the diocesan conference on 'The Bible and Recent Criticism,' and also at a working-men's meeting, and thence for a few days' rest to stay with Sir Edward Grey at Fallodon, and the Arthur Lytteltons at Eccles.

To his son Walter

'The Vicarage, Eccles: November 3, 1894.

'My dear Walter,—We have been wandering in old places and seeing old friends at Newcastle and Fallodon. Newcastle was rather horrid, cold and rainy, and I did nothing but make speeches, which was a dull occupation. . . . On Thursday we went to Fallodon. . . . It was a dull afternoon, but we floundered to the sea by Newton, and saw it in a stormy mood. The mud of Northumberland surpasses even my expectations; it was awful. Yesterday was a lovely day: the sun shone and it was quite warm. We went to Dunstanborough and ate our lunch on the sands. The colouring of the sea was blue and green and the sands a brilliant yellow, and everything was as nice as it could be. . . . On the way back we saw a few people in Embleton, and looked

into the church, which seemed much smaller than I remembered it to be. Lady Grey from Howick came to tea, and Lord Grey and Vera came to breakfast this morning. He was full of Africa, having just returned from a journey to Bulawayo. They both enjoyed it very much, and he told a remark of a colonist who, when the ship came into harbour at London on a foggy morning, looked sadly at the gloomy weather, and said, "This is no country for a white man." Now we are here after a day's journey, with the Lytteltons, and go home on Tuesday. Please do try and work harder and get out of your form, and tell Cuthbert to screw his head on tighter.'

At Eccles he preached on the Sunday morning and next day lectured in Manchester on Carthage. Then he went home to entertain the East Anglian bishops for their annual meeting at Peterborough, and immediately after that to Leicester for his autumn visit.

On December 2 he was summoned for the first time to preach before the Queen at Windsor.

To his niece Winifred Creighton

'December 7, 1894.

'Last Saturday I went to visit the Queen and preach to her on Sunday. That was exciting, was it not? I arrived at Windsor Castle about seven on Saturday and was shown to my room. Then a series of officials came to tell me what I was to do. At nine I went to dinner with the royal household, the lords and ladies in waiting. It was the Princess of Wales's birthday, and all the royal family almost was at Windsor. After dinner we went into the Queen's drawing-room, when she presently came in followed by the royal family. She is a little old woman, very much crippled in the legs by rheumatism, walking with a stick, and leaning on her Indian attendant, who was clad in a turban and a magnificent Oriental dress. There were the Duchess of York, the Princesses Victoria and Maud of Wales, &c. . . . They sat in a circle and we sat behind them. Then we had a concert . . . the Queen departed about 11.30 and we presently retired. On Sunday morning I breakfasted with the household and, at eleven had to preach in the Queen's private chapel. It was rather awful having a congregation of about fifty, with the Queen and the royalties in a box up above, just opposite the top of the pulpit. In the evening I dined with the Queen. It was not so awful as I had expected. I sat next Princess Beatrice, who was very nice. After dinner the Queen sent for me and we had a little talk in the drawing-room. She has a beautiful

voice, and was very nice and friendly. . . . I have scarcely been at home since the beginning of October.'

After this he was invited every year to Windsor, and each visit increased not only his loyalty, but his personal affection and devotion to the Queen.

LETTERS 1892-1894

To Mrs. T. H. Ward 'The Palace, Peterborough : February 3, 1892.

'Dear Mary,—I have been reading "David Grieve" with the greatest interest, and congratulate you most cordially on it. It is thoroughly human throughout and sends down many shafts deep into the recesses of human nature. It has convinced me that you are quite right in writing novels, and that you are enriching English literature with a new mode of expressing profound truths in a simple and attractive form. You have given an imaginative expression of many of the great problems of modern life with great subtlety and refined analysis. I think that "David Grieve" will never be forgotten, but will have a place in literature as a typical book of all that is best in the endeavours and feelings of our day.

'My interest in you will allow me to say that I think the advance on "Robert Elsmere" is enormous. That is the thing which strikes me at every page. I say this not because I depreciate the former book, but because there is no testimony which can more rejoice the true artist than the testimony to artistic growth. The characters are much stronger, the realisation is much more complete. All the people in "David" are real people, not types but realities. One feels that one has no right to criticise their actions : they did so, and in so doing acted up to the law of their being. All the subsidiary scenes are profoundly true, none more touching than old Margaret Dawson in her dotage. Then there is such a sense of reserved power about the book, that one surrenders oneself at once. The conception of the book is noble ; the development is natural and truthful ; the results are inevitable. What can I say more ? Criticism of minor points is disarmed ; it is not worth while.

'Two things only I wish to say, though with great deference. The reason why I set David above Robert is because the intellectual side of things is subordinate to the purely human. *Tendency* is a foe to art ; and the exact form of repose which David found for his soul is his own concern. I am glad that it was such a good one. But there are passages in his "diary" which were written by Mrs. Ward

and not by himself, and diaries are very dangerous things in novels

‘Then David’s power of assimilating knowledge is really too rapid. Men can rapidly develop capacities and display a power of mastering ideas. But they cannot in the midst of a practical life rapidly become acquainted with the literary form of ideas. The conception of the historical growth of ideas is the last that a self-made man would arrive at. I think David is too educated. In the constructive part of the book you have kept your own literary knowledge well in the background : but here and there it breaks out, and finds expression in the language of definite criticism. You are quite strong enough to do without it. I only wish to point out a temptation which you will be greater if you resist.

‘But I feel that I have no right even to do this. The book fills me with nothing but admiration, and it will be of great service to all the best interests of humanity,

‘Yours always affectionately,

‘M. PETRIBURG.’

To a former Newnham student ‘Peterborough : March 16, 1892.

‘I can assure you that, whatever your self may be to you, it is one of the least unpleasant things that I know, and I am always glad to hear about it. I can only say go on and prosper. The impulse will come some day.

‘But on one point I should like to console you. I feel prayer always difficult, not nearly so much of a refreshment as I hoped. I do not seem to improve in keeping my attention, and my thoughts continually wander. But, after all, the value of prayer lies in the intention, and we must only deplore our inadequate performance. The essential point is the readiness to submit to God’s guidance, and the sincere wish not to keep one’s life outside of His ken. That we can do : there may not be given to us the power of continued contemplation and communing. There are different gifts : we can only give what we have, and ask that our store may be increased.

‘I think, however, that there is a tendency to use unreal language about prayer, and to apply what is true of moments of great intensity of feeling to the ordinary performance of our daily duties. Life was not given for prayer, but prayer for life.

He prayeth best who loveth best
All things both great and small ;
For the great God who loveth us
He made and loveth all.

Write to me again some day, and believe me,

‘Yours always,

‘M. PETRIBURG.’

To Lady Grey

‘Peterborough : August 25, 1892.

‘My dear Dorothy,—I will not inflict a letter upon Edward, that would be unkind. But I should like to tell you how I am interested in his political progress.¹ He has had real good fortune, for he is not bound to mix himself up with the claptrap which is mistaken for politics, but is concerned with the real thing. For politics really consist in foreign politics. In internal matters Parliament can only register popular demand : and as statesmen have left off attempting to direct and form popular opinion, their skill consists in dragging into the foreground something which they think will suit their game. But in foreign affairs it is not so. Problems are set and have to be solved by wisdom. The future of England very little depends on internal changes. But the whole of the artificial basis of English life depends on England’s foreign relationships, and he who maintains them wisely will be seen to be the truest patriot. Therefore I rejoice that Edward has a worthy task, in which he need not sacrifice integrity, which it is so hard to maintain nowadays. I do not mean that is harder now than at any other time ; but men are more conscious now than of old of the sacrifice, and suffer more in consequence. But this is prosy.

‘You will miss your quiet ; you will become magnificent. Remember that if at any time you want to come to a place where no one will talk politics, this place is open. We never talk politics here.’

To Bishop Mitchinson

‘Peterborough : February 23, 1893.

‘Dear Bishop,—. . . I have sent on to you the rural deanery scheme from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. They raise two points. . . . But their questions about names show a stupidity which is alarming. I must really send them a memorandum on the subject.

‘(1) The termination “-tun,” “-ton,” “-town” is intelligible ; ignorant people in later times made a termination “-stone,” which is absurd. I do not know who the historic “Sib” was ; but you assuredly live in the town which he and his men founded,² hard by the similar settlement of one Athar. But what kind of a stone would deserve the epithet of “Sib” or “Ather” I must leave geologists to determine ; and what the meaning of these epithets could be no man could say.

‘(2) The older form of the English genitive was “-es,”

¹ Sir Edward Grey had been appointed Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs.

² Bishop Mitchinson was rector of Sibstone.

the more recent "s": there is [no] difference between Elmes-
thorpe and Elmsthorpe: both mean Elm's village, and per-
haps the elm was the tribal token.

'To think that clerks should solemnly sit and refer to
previous lists as of value about such things!

'Pardon my outbursts. But it is a magnificent instance
of bureaucracy without intelligence.'

To Mr. Horatio F. Brown

'Peterborough: April 8, 1893.

'Dear Brown,—I have delayed in thanking you for your
book on "Venice."¹ The reason was that I sat down to read
it, but have been so often called away by business that I have
only just finished it. This fact, however, makes my thanks
more genuine when they do come. You have succeeded
remarkably in getting at the essentials of your subject. And
how hard a subject it is! Venice is a *Kultur Stadt*; yet its
Kultur is not obvious in its history. The impression which
it produced on Europe in the days of its greatness is not the
same as the impression which it now makes on the modern
mind. Its æsthetic appeal is not, as in the case of Florence,
intimately associated with the events of its past history.
Nor does its history as such harmonise with modern concep-
tions. Like its site, Venice lies remote from the rest of
Europe, and it owes its charm now to the same cause as it
owed its greatness in the past. This point you have made
clear for the first time to English readers. You have made
Venice intelligible: could more be done? Your book will
be indispensable to anyone who really wishes to know. . . .

To the Rev. W. H. Carnegie, Rector of Great Witley

'Peterborough: April 28, 1893.

'Dear Carnegie,—I have been away confirming and had
not time to write a letter before. But I quite agree with the
main lines of your book.² I think the *title* will mislead some,
but titles are very difficult.

'Your main position that a certain mental attitude is
necessary for understanding any subject is indisputable. The
Agnostic position seems to me eminently unreasonable. It
is that of one who, having paid no heed to music, goes to a
concert and calls it "an ugly noise." The general view about
religion seems to be, that everyone should form his character,
or allow it to be formed, by circumstances: then, with a mind
so constituted and a character so moulded, he suddenly turns
his attention to religion and says: "There is very little in it.
It does not appeal to me." How could it?

¹ *Venice: an Historical Sketch.*

² *Through Conversion to the Creed.*

‘Further, people’s ideas about the nature of evidence are very vague. One of my clergy told me that he was at dinner with an eminent lawyer who said : “ I go to church and bring up my children as Christians ; but I am bound to say there is not so much evidence for it as would hang a man.” But the evidence necessary to hang a man is far beyond that on which we act for any practical venture of our own. Did he have as much evidence of the character of his wife before he married her as would suffice to hang a man ?

‘The question always comes : What is the starting point ? What do you expect ? There is in popular talk very little correspondence between what people demand from God and what He has promised to give.

‘Forgive these rambling remarks.’

To Mr. Robert Bridges

‘Peterborough : October 9, 1893.

‘Dear Bridges,—I have already wiped off the reproach with which you upbraided me. About a month ago I spent a Sunday at Brixworth, which is certainly one of the most interesting buildings in England. I do not know another which has gone through so many transformations. But all old buildings raise questions which are perplexing. Brixworth is unknown in early times ; it is not on a Roman road ; why had it a basilica of that size ? I could not gain much information about other Roman remains in the neighbourhood. It is a proof how little has been done for a survey of Roman Britain. I wish some society could be formed to work at that subject in various localities.

‘But this is an old scheme of mine, which I want to float some day.’

To the Rev. R. S. Baker, rector of Hargrave ‘December 9, 1893.

‘Dear Mr. Baker,—I have read your book¹ with great pleasure, and quite agree with your argument that the difficulties of unbelief are at least as great as those of belief, and that believers are no stupider than unbelievers. A statement of that position is likely to be extremely useful.

‘Of the three modes of thought which affect the evidences of Christianity at the present day, you have omitted one. Natural science and historical criticism have been before you ; but the study of comparative religion has not. I do not, however, believe that that line of argument comes before the ordinary (man) so much as the others ; indeed its results are not yet capable of being formulated.’

In reply to a letter sending him in proof a chapter in Mr. Lilly's 'Claims of Christianity.'

To Mr. W. S. Lilly 'The Palace, Peterborough : March 26, 1894.

'My dear Lilly,—I have been so busy with sermons and letters that I have (only) just found time to give your pages the attention which they deserve. I do not think that I have any suggestion to make of any importance. Perhaps you have confined *Humanism* to Italy, as glorified by Symonds. In Germany it was more serious as represented by Cusa, Brandt, Trithæmius, and the rest, and the difference which German scholars felt between themselves and Italians was one of Luther's great helps. Again, the papal decadence is undoubted in the sphere of politics; but beneath the surface the Papacy was steadily growing, and the growth of the Curia is the sign. The very prevalence of immorality was a help to it; dispensations, indulgences, and the rest increased enormously, and a new theology justified them, and supplied the officials of the Curia with *formulæ*. Alexander VI. was hailed at his coronation as "semi-deus." Humanism supplied a definition, a category which was wanting; further the description was accurate, for the indulgence system and the various functions of the Penitentiary and the Rota gave the papal power a place in the ordinary life of the ordinary man. In fact, a man's soul could scarcely be saved without the special intervention of the Pope in some shape or another. These claims and the corresponding system disappeared after Trent, silently and gradually as it had arisen. Protestant protests, it is generally forgotten, were directed not against the system defined at Trent, but a previous system, which it is now difficult to reproduce. Let me give you an instance. Bona, widow of Galeazzo Sforza, after her husband's murder, submitted a case to the theologians of Paris, to know if the Pope could give a plenary remission from Purgatory, posthumously, to one who died impenitent and was described: "symonias fecit scandalosas et notorias; violavit virgines; scelera infinita, more tyrannorum perpetravit." The Paris doctors answered "Yes." Now the position of an official on whom was thrust, by general desire, the power of putting everyone spiritually right, no matter what they did, was enormous. And it was in the period called the Renaissance that this grew and prospered. This rendered the "reform of the Curia," which is easily prescribed, very difficult. It was not the reform of officials, not the loss of income, but the difficulty of getting the papal

power clear of these outgrowths, which had grown from popular demand, and of which the abolition would have been very unpopular.

'This is wandering, but you say, p. 164, "on the people at large the Renaissance had hardly any influence." In Italian cities it appealed to their eyes; it influenced their morals, it expressed itself religiously in this way. People wished to be religious without being moral. Under Alexander VI. the religious ceremonies of the Pope were scrupulously attended to; so too under Leo X. There was no lack of decorum; and there was no popular sense of discrepancy. The absence of morality is more striking than the vice—freedom certainly produced strange results. The work of the Jesuits in re-establishing discipline, as moral, was certainly very difficult; and they do not deserve the treatment which is often accorded to them. Symonds regards them as the overthrowers of the Renaissance; but he has supplied enough evidence that the Renaissance led everything to destruction—the Church, society, politics. He does not give his own prescription for the way out of the mess. Perhaps we cannot entirely approve of either the Lutheran, the Calvinistic, the Anglican, or the Jesuit solutions of their problems. But the Renaissance had no solution at all.'

To Mrs. J. R. Green

Peterborough : April 21, 1894.

'My dear Mrs. Green,—Thank you very much for your book.¹ I did not write at once to thank you, because I wanted to read it first. I have not yet found time to finish it, as I have been very busy confirming and away from home. But I am delighted with the book, which is full of new information, to me at least, and put so clearly that everyone can take in its significance. To me it is admirable as a key to the revolutions of the sixteenth century. It reads as if it were an introduction to this subject. It shows the inner history of the fifteenth century, of the Wars of the Roses, and the reconstruction of Henry VII. The corresponding reign of Louis XII. in France is equally significant of the forces behind the French monarchy. In fact, one is led on to consider the reconstruction of Europe on commercial and industrial lines. One sees how the Church was the least flexible member of society, as such; its landlords were permanent and resident, and had not the means of entering into the new conditions. Hence it was an obstacle to the aspirations of the middle class. I am diverging. All I can

¹ *Town Life in the Fifteenth Century.*

say is that your book seems to me to be the worthy successor of Mr. Green's work, and carries on his spirit into a detailed treatment of a particular epoch in a way which is sure to be fruitful.'

To Mr. W. S. Lilly (in reply to a question whether the Bishop knew of any instance of an indulgence being given for future and uncommitted sin)

'Peterborough : September 14, 1894.

'My dear Lilly,—It is hard to assert a negative ; but I should find it hard to believe Reade's statement. Loescher, "Reformations-Acta" i. 355, &c., collects all the statements made at the time against indulgences ; but there was no definite tax, that I know of, for special sins. The poor were to have them *gratis* ; other people were to pay proportionately to their income. Weever, "Funeral Monuments," p. clix., gives a bull of Alexander VI. to England estimating the payments to be made. The indulgences in Loescher are for involuntary homicide after the act ; it is true that the ground alleged seems trivial ; a stone thrown by accident slew a man, &c. But I cannot believe that any indulgence bore on the face of it that it was 'pro peccatis commissis vel committendis.' Of course it might be said that an indulgence to be used after confession *in articulo mortis* practically gave spiritual immunity for a sin which a man had the intention of committing at the time when he procured the indulgence. But this raises the whole question.

'We shall know shortly all that can be known about indulgences. Mr. H. C. Lea of Philadelphia is bringing out a book on the subject. He is the man who knows most of any living man about the institutes of the mediæval Church. But he groans to me in letters over the difficulty of apprehending this most slippery subject.'

To the Rev. G. Bell (Headmaster of Marlborough College)

'The Palace, Peterborough : January 24, 1894.

'Dear Bell,—Thank you very much for finding time to write and tell me of Cuthbert's promotion. It will be good for him to be in the sixth, and I hope he may make a spurt. He has been growing so much lately that his vigour may now be free for intellectual purposes.

'But I find it very hard to know what is the ideal of a boy's development at present. I feel that an unconscious change is passing over our educational system, so that its external marks no longer correspond as they once did to the facts of life. I mean that in our university days we could say that success at the university meant success afterwards. But

this is no longer the case. Life itself is the great educator; and *character* becomes daily more important than *attainments*. As educational methods have improved their value has grown smaller. I find myself choosing men for posts solely with regard to their proved capacity; and I am struck by the small connexion between that and their university distinction. It used not to be so; the two used to be closely connected. I cannot quite account for the difference. Perhaps you may have an answer.

‘As regards Cuthbert, all I can do is to point out to him that his future is in his own hands. As regards the influence of Marlborough on his character, I think it has been entirely good. You will in time consider which university he should go to. I have no preference. I should like him to get a scholarship, if possible, as a stimulus; but that must depend.’

‘August 6, 1894.

‘One’s children . . . do not turn out as one expected . . . Systems of education and ways of dealing with them seem to me to contribute very little to anyone’s development—positively that is, negatively they have their value. Everybody has to make himself, and how to fix on him the sense of responsibility is a difficult, indeed an insoluble, question. . . . Some will learn from the discipline of schools; others need the sterner discipline of life. It is always the same story; the enjoyment of the present obscures the issues of the future.’

To Miss Helen Bell (on her engagement)

‘The Palace, Peterborough: August 28, 1894.

‘My dear Helen,—Your news arrived yesterday just as I was leaving home for a hard day’s work. I take the first opportunity of sending you my congratulations. I am *very* glad. It seldom happens that one knows both sides; generally one has to express one’s satisfaction with faith. But now I know and can say that nothing could be better.

‘Well, all I can say is, may you be very happy; and there is all probability that such you will be.

‘But letters of any kind are dull reading at such a time. The heart, stirred with emotion unfelt before, becomes conscious of a new revelation of itself and its capacities, of life and its meaning. The stimulus of seeing another heart open before it fills it with feelings far beyond the power of expression. The deep is broken up, and new worlds come into sight. The time of an engagement is a time when one is a bore to other people, because one is soaring beyond and above the ordinary sphere. Treasure your visions, they will

be useful to you. None of them is a mere dream ; they are eternally true. All that we have ever seen is real : alas, that we do not see it always.

‘ I am moralising ; but the old are glad to renew their youth ; and their sympathy is sincere because it comes from reminiscence.’

To his daughter Lucia at Newnham College

‘ Farnham Castle : October 16, 1894.

‘ I am deeply interested in all that befalls you at Newnham, your pursuits, your friends and everything. . . . You will find out lots of things about yourself from intercourse with others, and from unwrapping your own mind. Therefore, if it is a bore to you at first in some ways, never mind ; you will see what comes—and will learn to put yourself by the side of others.

‘ We have been gadding about till I am weary. . . . Yesterday I helped to consecrate two bishops, and came off here in the evening. We have Mr. Labouchere staying : he is very nice, only he makes me talk and smoke too much. He is quite excellent to talk to about politics, because he has no illusions.’

To Mr. Edmund Gosse

‘ Peterborough : October 24, 1894.

‘ Thank you much for your poems, ‘ In Russet and Silver ; ’ they touch a note that vibrates much in me—the subdued gloom of middle age. This has not yet had its poet : yet surely its experiences and aspirations deserve a record which you have given with feeling which entrances. I read and meditated yesterday in a railway train to my great solace, and I am just going away again, and shall finish the book to-day. It was very good of you to send it me. It is a memory of old times which are never forgotten. Every year of mechanic labour makes the expansiveness of earlier days more precious.’

To his daughter Lucia

‘ Scotby, Carlisle : October 29, 1894.

‘ I suppose you are busy between lectures and society. I am glad that you enjoy your lectures. Try to read all the Domesday you can : it is most useful to get to understand old documents. It is merely a matter of a little time and practice, and the result is worth getting. Gwatkin’s lectures will make you think, and so will Seeley’s : only Seeley’s will probably make you think differently from him—I do not know that history can be limited to politics. The

Greek word *ιστορία* means *enquiry*, and history is properly any enquiry into the past. Of course our curiosity is about different things at different times. But we want to find in any period what was most important in it : and we want also to bring it into some relation to ourselves at present. *Politics*, I suppose, means the organisation of society by the State : but we often want to know more than that ; literature, art, ideas, religion, all have their place, and some periods are entirely engaged with them. Of course all these things pass into society, but we cannot find them always in government or in matters relating to government. I think history is concerned with what men did and thought, just as much as how they were governed ; and I do not like any arbitrary limitations. Of course a man may say that political history is the chief thing : it is certainly the most difficult, and needs most working.'

' November 14.

' I see that you are like everybody else, complaining of your memory. It does not matter reading books and forgetting them : you do not forget so much as you suppose. Don't read your books as books, but as illustrating a *subject*. Make notes on the subject, and regard that every book you read fills up something, gives you some new ideas, makes the process more intelligible. Remember that men in history were human beings like yourself, and acted from the same motives. Gregory of Tours is very good to read, for he is so far away, and there is so little of him that you are thrown upon your imagination and your intelligence to make out what happened. This is just the opposite of Professor Seeley's method of analysing methods of government. One begins at the top, and the other at the bottom : one with the institutions in the abstract, the other with the men. Good-bye : I have two speeches to prepare. God bless you.'

To Mr. Edmund Gosse

' Leicester : November 19, 1894.

' Your paper on Pater seems to me admirable. It delicately touches his chief characteristics. I have only suggested one or two pedantic alterations for academical accuracy. Your pages suggest to me many reminiscences, as, how Pater when he travelled with his sisters always left a place if anyone staying in the hotel spoke to him ; how in quite early days I remember dining with him, and Bonamy Price was there : conversation turned on ecclesiastical matters, and Pater passed on to a dreamy monologue about the beauty of the reserved Sacrament in Roman churches which "gave them

all the sentiment of a house where lay a dead friend." Bonamy Price's Protestantism was aroused and a theological discussion ensued which waxed so warm that I suggested a retreat to the drawing-room. This was in 1873, and proves that Pater's interest in ecclesiastical matters was never dead. Again I remember Pater interposing in a serious discussion in common room at B. N. C. about university reform by saying "I do not know what your object is ; at present the undergraduate is a child of nature : he grows up like a wild rose in a country lane : you want to turn him into a turnip, rob him of all grace, and plant him out in rows." Again at our examination for scholarships he undertook to look over the English Essays : when we met to compare marks, Pater had none : he said languidly, "They did not much impress me." He was asked to give his impressions, and the names were read out in alphabetical order. Pater shook his head sadly as each was read, and said dreamily, "I do not recall him," "He did not strike me," and so on. At last the reader came to the name of Sanctuary, on which Pater's face lit up, and he said, "Yes : I remember : I liked his name."

'I make you a depository of these reminiscences which your paper has recalled. It was always a sorrow to me that I never saw much of him after leaving Oxford. He would never go and stay anywhere.'

CHAPTER IV

THE STRIKE IN THE BOOT AND SHOE TRADE

AFTER all that he had heard about the prevalence of Dissent and of the most advanced forms of rationalistic thought in Leicester and Northampton, the Bishop was agreeably surprised to find how much vigorous Church life there was in both places. It seemed to him that opposition had been useful, that it had obliged men to think things out, and to give their best energies in support of the cause which they had made their own. But the growth of Leicester especially had been so rapid as to outstrip all religious energies. There was no room for animosity between Church and Dissent. However much each might do, it seemed impossible to supply the spiritual needs of the growing population. The Bishop's relations with nonconformists were most friendly. He was ready to appreciate their work, and to dwell on that foundation of faith common to all Christians, but he did not minimise differences, and was never concerned with any question of reunion ; he did not believe it to be a practical question. To him the important thing was that men should try to understand one another, and to work together as far as possible. He wrote : ' I should say that we can join all men in work which is *hortative* or *preventive* ; when the subject is edifying we must do it on our own lines.' Canon Stocks, his Rural Dean at Leicester, writes :

' His relations to nonconformists in what has been called the metropolis of nonconformity were thoroughly healthy. No leader of opinion in the Church of England could be more honest in maintaining on certain questions a conviction or a policy contrary to those commonly received and held amongst nonconformists. This was notably the case on the education question. Yet he won their respect and regard, and where they differed from him it was never his manner of maintaining what he held to be the true position which repelled.

His habit always was to take people as he found them, and to meet them on those points on which he could understand them or sympathise with them. Then, when a friendly relation had been established, he could, if he thought well, proceed further.

This habit helped him much in Leicester and Northampton. Both places were aggressively Radical in politics, and it was a common idea that Churchman and Tory were convertible terms. Probably no one in either place ever succeeded in defining the Bishop's politics. The split in the Liberal party over Home Rule had made him less of a party politician than ever; whilst his office of itself lifted him above the necessity of belonging to any political party, and this fitted in with the natural tendency of his mind. He used to ignore party politics and treat political questions, if he touched them, sometimes from the historical side, sometimes from a wide national point of view. It was impossible either for the intelligent working-men or the hard-headed business men of Leicester and Northampton not to recognise his absolute freedom from prejudice, the frank openness of his mind, the width and comprehensiveness of his ideas, or to fail to be inspired by his genuine love for the people and desire for their welfare. With the leading business men he got on all the better because of his genuine appreciation of their capacities. He was sometimes sadly conscious of the overwhelming importance attached to material things and of the want of culture in a place so new as Leicester; and this made him eager to do all he could to promote the higher interests of the city. He was ready to help in every educational scheme, and always willing himself to lecture either to the Literary and Philosophical Institute, or to the Co-operative Society, or to other organisations of working men. He never avoided plain speaking, either about the failings or duties of his hearers, and he always tried to lead working-men to understand the real meaning of the Church, and what the existence of an Established Church did for the nation. His bits of practical advice were calculated to stick in men's minds. He told his audience at a working-men's meeting held at the Folkestone Church Congress, that their duty as members of Christ's Church was to take

their children to church on Sunday and sit beside them; to help their clergy, to feel towards them as if they could slap them on the back; to carry their religion into the workshop. 'You know,' he said, 'that we have a crook in our arm. Why was it given to us? It was given to us that we might put it through the arm of another fellow and guide him on the straight way.' The stories he told, the illustrations which enlivened his speeches, showed how intimately he knew the life of the working classes. When speaking in his own Diocese, he always tried to get his audience to feel the personal bond between him and them. To a meeting of working-men held at the time of the Leicester Diocesan Conference in 1893, he said, 'Though I already have many friends among you, I shall never be satisfied until many of you stop me in the streets, shake me by the hand, and tell me how you are getting on at home, how the missus is and the children.' As often as he could, he visited some factory or workshop, and was ready to address the men at their dinner hour, and to try to understand all about the conditions of their work.

In 1893, with the Bishop's approval, the Leicester clergy got up a course of addresses on 'The Church and Economics' in St. Martin's Church on Sunday afternoons, followed on the same evening by a conference in the schools on the subject of the afternoon's address, at which the preacher might be questioned. The Bishop was to give the first address, and it was suggested that he should be spared the evening's conference. To this he would not agree.

To the Rev. H. Orford

'August 30, 1893.

'I am quite with you and Sanders, and will help you as far as I can. I could come on January 7, but I feel that I ought not to wish to escape being "heckled," and if I came, I would go to the meeting also. Suppose my subject was called "The Gospel and Society"—I would be quite general and would try and point out the limits within which the Church can actively influence matters.'

In his address he showed how the spirit of Christianity had always led to the 'fullest recognition of the equal duties and of the equal rights of all men; equal duties first,

and equal rights following in the second place.' In the discussions after these addresses men of all kinds of opinions joined, but it proved possible to maintain courtesy and good feeling. Of course no definite results were attained, but the bringing together of men of such widely different views, and getting them to treat one another with mutual consideration, could not fail to be productive of a better understanding. The Bishop's appearance at such a discussion, and the way in which he took part in it, did much to win for him the confidence of the Leicester working-men.

When he was appointed to London in 1896, he received a letter from a man then working as headmaster of a small Church school in London showing the effect produced by his address on this last occasion :

'I had been a doubter in religious matters . . . but the barrenness of scepticism began to make itself felt, and I was eagerly watching for some guide to give me some rational basis on which I might once more plant my early faith. I was in the congregation at St. Martin's when you preached the first of a series of sermons on industrial questions. That sermon, or rather your Lordship's personality, was the turning-point for me. From then until spring in last year I did not miss ever hearing you when you came to Leicester. Hence my indebtedness to your Lordship. I have many times wished to be able to thank you.'

The winter recreation of Leicester is football, and the Saturday half-holiday is spent by very many of the inhabitants either in playing or watching the game, whilst the great roar made by the cheers and shouts of the interested crowd penetrates to every part of the town. The Bishop showed his sympathy with the amusements of the people by consenting to preach at a service held on April 8, 1894, at St. Martin's Church, Leicester, for the members of the football clubs. He spoke to them of what the Incarnation teaches as to the nature of the body and the real unity of life, and said that, just as their bodies needed refreshment on Saturdays after the monotony of the week's work, so did their souls need refreshment on Sundays; the training, the discipline, the recreation that was necessary for the health of their bodies was necessary also for the health of their souls. The struggle

after greater dexterity in the football field was a parable of the course of their spiritual life. At football, faculties were called out for which their ordinary life offered no scope, and in the short, sharp struggle there came to them something like a revelation of new faculties, some better, some worse. So all life was a revelation. They would constantly find themselves called upon to do things they had never dreamt of, and that call would reveal to them new capacities.

Already at Embleton he had shown his interest in friendly societies by becoming an Oddfellow, and when in 1894 the Oddfellows held their annual gathering at Northampton, he preached at the church parade. He reminded them that nothing outside themselves could bring the peace for which all men long. Men want God's gifts, but will not seek them in God's way :

'How can you expect the nation as a whole to keep peace if in trade disputes you will not show a peaceful temper and try to settle your disputes in peaceful ways ; if you are unable to discuss political questions soberly and in a fair-minded way ? A great responsibility attaches to all those who meddle with politics ; their temper of mind, the nature of the arguments they use, have a tremendous influence. How dangerous is the temper of mind which misrepresents opponents, falsifies issues, is full of prejudice, treats great questions with levity, refuses to be guided by the evidence before it. . . . Unless you get rid of that temper in your own small affairs, and practise yourselves in conducting your own business with sobriety and open-mindedness, you are not doing your utmost to make this a peace-loving nation. . . . Your deliberations will disclose differences of opinion : it is good to have them, but the way in which he approaches differences of opinion is a great test of a man. No self-restraint is so valuable as that involved in listening to opinions with which you do not agree, until it dawns upon you that there are stores of hidden wisdom which you do not know, that it is possible that your way is not the only way, even that it may not be the right way.'

On many other occasions also he preached at the church parades of friendly societies. He showed constant interest as well in the different co-operative societies, especially in their educational work. In the autumn of 1894 he was asked to address the Loughborough Liberal Club, and chose

as his subject, 'Some Principles affecting Social Legislation.' Mr. Johnson Ferguson, M.P., was in the chair, and said that in the twenty-three years of his political life he had never presided at a meeting in a political club which was addressed by a bishop. In his speech the Bishop said that all would understand that it was in no political spirit that he was present with them, and that he was glad that they should wish sometimes to hear questions discussed on their own merits apart from their political bearing. He tried to get his hearers to realise the complexity of social problems; they were not problems to which an answer could be worked out. 'You cannot get things clear because you want them to be clear, nor get an answer to a question simply because you try to work it out as you would a sum in arithmetic.' He spoke of their individual responsibility. 'At the present day England is carrying the burdens of civilisation upon its shoulders, and the great question before Englishmen is, "Will the shoulders of England continue to be strong enough to bear these burdens?" The strength of England depends upon the collective wisdom and capacity for judgment of its citizens. That wisdom and judgment you can only gain after a sober survey of actual facts, which you must judge with reference to things actually before you, without being carried away by dreams or visions.' He told them that he thought they attached too much importance to legislation. 'A law is the expression of the will of the community. . . . There can be no law if there are many people determined to break it . . . no advantages can be gained by legislation which leaves any considerable body of the community with a sense of injustice.' In conclusion he stated that 'the main social problems of the day were the more equal distribution of the profits of production, and the better organisation of labour; these two things concern not only the men but the masters, the positions of the two are not really antagonistic . . . real progress can only come about by an absolutely good understanding between them. They ought constantly to meet in order to discuss matters of equal interest to both.' His advice to the working-men was to strive not so much for higher wages as for regular employment. 'Common effort, with strict respect for justice, mutual regard for all, and that common sense

which had made England what it was, would enable them to solve the problems before them.'

He ever tried to get men to see the connexion between their religion and their ordinary life of social and economic activity, and therefore willingly brought before the clergy in the chief towns of his diocese the proposal made by the London Reform Union to observe one Sunday in the year as Reform or Citizen Sunday, and to preach to their people about a citizen's duties. His suggestion—for he naturally did not allow it to take any other form—was very generally acted upon. But when he left Peterborough the custom dropped, to be revived some years later by the Mayor of Leicester.

When in 1894 he delivered his Primary Charge, he gave that part of it which dealt with social problems at Leicester, and spoke of the way in which the clergy might help in dealing with these problems :

'The clergy are, as a rule, from the mere nature of their vocations, the class in the community which is least versed in business affairs. They are little suited as a body to decide economic questions. . . . I believe that what men of all kinds of opinion would all join in advising [them to aim at] is benevolent neutrality in trade disputes, constant helpfulness in alleviating inevitable distress, outspoken criticism of all unfairness, and unswerving maintenance of the great principle of justice. . . . I would urge my brethren to learn all that they can of the actual facts of the occupations of those amongst whom they labour, to discover their aims, and to apply to all impartially the tests of Christian morality. The great need of our day is that all human relationships should be first moralised and then spiritualised.'¹

An opportunity soon came for him to put his views into practice, and show how his efforts to understand the lives and interests of both masters and men, and to give them at all times his sympathy and friendship, had won their confidence. Early in 1895, there were rumours of disputes in the boot and shoe trade. The Bishop was in Italy in February and the early part of March, and returned just before lock-out notices were issued by the Manufacturers' Federation, by which 120,000 people were thrown out of work. Leicester and Northampton were the places chiefly affected. The

¹ *The Church and the Nation*, p. 57.

clergy and other ministers of religion had, some little time before, issued an appeal to both sides in the contest, imploring them to give the matter further consideration before taking irrevocable steps; but with no avail. The Bishop wrote to Canon Stocks immediately on his return :

‘ March 18, 1895.

‘ The strike is very grievous. The “ Times ” article to-day gives a fair account of the difficulties, I take it. Your memorial was excellent and will bear fruit. But one feels that there must be some time before a basis of agreement emerges. The gravity of the crisis, the pressure of public opinion, must tell on both sides; they must be compelled to formulate their demands. If I could be of any use, I need not say that nothing would stand in my way. But I feel that some opening ought to be given me if possible. There have been offers of mediation, I see, from sources which might have been acceptable. I do not know who would wish to confer with me. But, if you see a chance, I will place myself at anyone’s disposal; though I have nothing to offer except good intentions and impartiality. I have been thinking if I could write you a letter for the benefit of the clergy, but for publication. But it is difficult, and might be useless. I will think some more, but am overwhelmed with letters just now. I am inconclusive, I feel: but about such a matter one can only pray for guidance. I own that as a matter of principle I deprecate episcopal interference with economic questions. But I am ready to sink anything for the purpose of helping.’

‘ Peterborough : March 19, 1895.

‘ I enclose you the result of my meditations, and am sending you copies for distribution among the clergy. Perhaps you will also send to the local papers.

‘ I have had little time for reflection, but I think I have said nothing which can give offence. I showed it to Clayton, and he had no objections to raise. It is for us to represent the moral sense of the public. I hope that my lead may not be without effects on the language and expressions of others.’

With this he sent the following letter :

‘ March 18, 1895.

‘ My dear Canon Stocks,—I cannot refrain from expressing my deep sympathy with my clergy in the sadness which they must necessarily feel at the industrial dispute now so seriously affecting the welfare of the community in which they labour. I am glad to know that all the representatives

of the Christian religion joined in urging upon employers and employed the need for serious consideration before they engaged in strife. Their appeal was not immediately successful; but I trust that the struggle which was held to be inevitable will be powerfully influenced by the spirit which that appeal expressed. It urged three great pleas—the unity of society, the grave responsibility attaching to any breach of that unity, and fair and open discussion as the only means of composing differences. These are truths which ought to be before the eyes of all men, and they cannot be too strongly or too persistently set forward. They are principles which must ultimately prevail.

‘My object in writing to you is to exhort my clergy to emphasise these truths whenever an opportunity is offered. Now that the strife has broken out, they must redouble their efforts for peace, and must not lose courage. I would submit some considerations for their guidance.

‘The complexity of industrial life raises from time to time questions of great difficulty to decide fairly. The boot and shoe industry has passed through several stages, with exceptional rapidity, during the last few years. It is, I am willing to believe, hard for the most fair-minded and best-informed man to decide with any certainty how it can best be organised. Industrial disputes always involve matters about which certain knowledge is almost impossible. They cannot be explained as due to greed on one side, or ignorance on the other; and I am glad to think that such causes are not alleged in this case. But when an industry has passed through rapid changes, there is uncertainty on one side and uneasiness on the other. An exact basis of agreement is not obvious, not through any want of goodwill, but through the limitations of human foresight. I therefore deprecate any hasty judgment upon the actual points which are supposed to be in dispute. It may well be that the statements on both sides are imperfect; and they are easily misjudged, because they deal with details which cannot be understood by themselves. We are bound to believe that both sides are sincere, and are willing to set the general good before their own advantage.

‘But we are equally bound to impress upon both parties that suspension from work is to be regarded as affording time for a careful examination of the points in dispute, and a search for a basis of agreement. They could not agree before because they had not time both to work and to investigate great questions. They have stopped work without

any ill-feeling towards one another, that they may give their attention in common to provide for the future. The gravity of the situation is now before them. They see all that their disagreement implies to the rest of the community. They are responsible for the energy and goodwill which they bring to the settlement of their differences. The dispute must be settled, not by an appeal to the brute force of endurance, but by wisdom and conscience, quickened by a heightened sense of responsibility. The whole community has a right to demand that no time be wasted by pride or obstinacy. It may not be able to judge of the particular points of dispute; but it can judge, and will eagerly scan, the temper shown in bringing these points into shape for decision.

‘I think that it is the great duty of the clergy to urge these great moral considerations, without any spirit of partisanship; to aim at removing hindrances to friendly discussion, to ask day by day what has been done, to discountenance all appeals to passion, to uphold the standard of justice, to sympathise with every effort for peace.

‘They may do something by their exhortations; they will do more by their prayers. It is their great duty to bring to bear upon all things “the mind of Christ.” I trust that all the churches in the town will be open, and that notices will be placed at the entrances that they are places for prayer and meditation in the sight of God. The hours of daily service should also be clearly stated, and all should be exhorted to bring themselves into God’s presence, who alone can “make men to be of one mind.” I would further ask that the Prayer for Unity in the Accession Service be said after the Collects of the Day.

‘Commending you to the grace of God in my prayers,

‘I am, your faithful servant and brother in Christ Jesus,

‘M. PETRIBURG.’

The dispute was more bitter at Leicester than at any other part of the district affected. At first it seemed hopeless to try to get the opposing parties to understand one another. It would not be worth while to explain here the very intricate and technical points on which the dispute turned. The Bishop took all possible trouble to understand it, and completely mastered the questions at issue. But from the first he did not think it would be wise for him to put himself forward as a mediator. The following letters show what he tried to do :

To the Rev. Canon Stocks

‘Peterborough : March 24, 1895.

‘There is much to be said for prayer meetings, in any form, which deal with the need of peace and turn men’s minds to seek counsel of God. Would a *united* meeting be the best? I rather doubt about the wisdom of beginning with a general appeal. It might be begun humbly in various districts. I think that all Christians might well combine and we might see what response it met with. If it were begun, it should go on daily, be at a suitable hour, and be brief and quite simple.

‘But if a general appeal were made at once it might fail, as it might seem to be a demonstration on one side or the other. What was done simply on a small scale would not be subjected to criticism; but if a large attempt were made the language used would be very closely scanned, and everyone engaged in it would be held responsible for anything that was said.

‘I have some hopes that the meeting to-day may lead to some results.

‘Who is Mr. Ward, the head of the Masters’ Federation? Is he a Leicester man? Could you approach him at all and learn if he would welcome a talk over matters? The best hope is that some impartial person or persons should be a medium of communication between the respective leaders. The first practical step is to secure this if possible. Intervention, unless it is welcomed, would only spoil the future chance, and would count as fussy interference.’

‘Peterborough : March 25, 1895.

‘. . . . I am always meditating about the strike. Mr. Labouchere has supplied an object lesson: (1) he struck in too soon; (2) he simplified the matter too much; (3) he proposed far too much all at once; (4) he was open to the suspicion of making capital out of the offer for political purposes; (5) his proposed board was too large, too political and not sufficiently impartial. He has made the matter worse, decidedly worse, by his action, and has emphasised the need of prudence.

‘Now it seems to me that the first thing to settle is the terms of reference to arbitration. The strike cannot go on long: it cannot be ended by despair; it must be made to assume the appearance of a compromise, or an approach to agreement. Arbitration is inevitable: the question is, what is it to be about?

This can only be settled by negotiation, and the negotia-

tion would be easiest by the appointment of one or two persons who would let both sides talk the point out, and would simply offer their services as removing obstacles and keeping the discussion to the point. It would take some little time and would need continuous sitting. Could you in any way urge this? It would be best done privately. Could you see Mr. Ward either alone or with others. If I could be of any use, I am always ready : but I do not wish to interfere unless I am to some degree trusted : and I have no qualities except average common sense and real impartiality. If I were not sure that I was impartial, I would abstain. For this preliminary work the absence of expert knowledge would not matter. Some sort of conference ought to be set on foot as soon as possible.

‘ Peterborough : March 28, 1895.

‘ I had reasons of my own for thinking that something was being done towards negotiation. It now appears that Mr. Labouchere has been finally swept away : and Mr. Ward’s letter to-day hints at the possibility of negotiations on another basis. I wish you would see him and ask if my services would be of any avail,—either now or afterwards. You would frankly tell him that my sole wish was to be useful as a buffer, that I have no prejudices, and that I have no axe to grind. He would tell you with equal frankness his opinion. I will make no public statement of anything about this : it will be merely private between you and him.’

The Bishop was gratified by receiving the following letter from the secretary of the Northampton Trades Council :

‘ March 29, 1895.

‘ My Lord,—At the monthly meeting of the above Council held in the Town Hall on Wednesday March 27, the following resolution was carried unanimously.

‘ That this Council, representing 9,000 workmen, wishes to place on record our hearty approval of the action taken by the Bishop of Peterborough, Mr. Labouchere and others, to secure a peaceful settlement of the dispute in the boot and shoe trade by arbitration, and would respectfully urge upon them the necessity of not resting until their efforts are successful.

‘ The opinion was also freely expressed that any efforts made by you would in all probability be more successful than those made by any prominent politician.’

To the Rev. Canon Stocks

‘Peterborough : March 30, 1895.

‘ You may have seen that the Trades Council of Northampton passed a resolution thanking me and Mr. Labouchere for our efforts after arbitration. But it was sent to me with the significant remark that the opinion of the meeting was “that efforts made by you would in all probability be more successful than those made by any prominent politician.”

‘ If this view prevails, the time has come when I may at least offer my services without presumption. Can you see some one of the men’s leaders, and discover if they are ready to confer, on any such lines as I have indicated? I simply propose to be a go-between, and prepare for a conference, which should discuss terms of arbitration.

‘ I am giving you a great deal of trouble, but the matter is one of vital importance. And you will see that any personal intervention of mine is useless till it is accepted as at all events harmless. If I were to write, still more if I were to go, there would be an amount of publicity which would be dangerous. Things are effective in proportion to the careful preparation made for them.

‘ I go to London to-night to preach at the Chapel Royal to-morrow, but come back to-morrow night. If you send me a telegram saying *Come*, I will come to Leicester on Monday morning at twelve. Otherwise I shall come anyhow on Tuesday afternoon. But things now seem to be ripe, and time ought not to be lost.’

Private

‘ Peterborough : April 1, 1895.

‘ Your news is excellent. I have written to Mr. Ward to ask what hour would suit him on Wednesday. I can now tell you in deadly confidence that I saw the President of the Board of Trade and also the chief permanent secretary last Monday, and discussed with them what *they* were to do. I have an inveterate objection to make personal capital out of this or anything. I put it to the President that he was the nearest approach to a public representative of the parties concerned, and that he was to try first. We entirely agreed about the course of action to be pursued. I have been waiting to hear some sign of results. You see that they are coming. The next difficulty will be from the side of the men. The character of their leaders is not of prime importance : it is their reasonableness.’

After this a conference was arranged in London between Sir Courtenay Boyle, the permanent secretary of the Board of Trade, and representatives of the men and the masters.

The Bishop wrote to Sir Courtenay Boyle from Leicester to tell him all that he had been able to discover about the attitude of both sides, in the hopes that his information might be of some service at the conference. In thanking him for the letter, Sir Courtenay Boyle wrote: 'Your letter was of very great use. A navigator in a strange sea highly values a chart.' They were in constant correspondence throughout the conference. After the first meetings, which promised well, Sir Courtenay Boyle wrote:

'April 6, 1895.

'The great hitch yesterday was as regards country work. The men's representatives, not without, I imagined, some doubts in their own minds, protested against the right of the employers to send out work at all from districts in which statements were in force.

'Are you able to tell me whether there is anything in the agreements which amounts to an honourable or moral contract to give all available work to the men in the district affected? If there is not, do you think it would clear the ground if an authoritative person were consulted on, and advised on this point? . . . I think there is a better tone than there was. Pray give me any hint that you have available.'

The Bishop to the Rev. Canon Stocks

Private

'Peterborough: April 7, 1895.

'So far so good. The *crux* now is the country work, on which I want information. Would you mind seeing Inskip privately for me, and asking him to tell you his views on this point? Especially discover:

'(1) Does he hold that it is contrary to agreements previously made between men and masters? If so, what? Would he consent to submit this question to some authoritative person to decide?

'(2) Do the men really want the finishing work to be retained in the factory more in the interests of the work-people actually employed or in the interest of the strength of their union organisation?

'(3) What is the amount of work sent out to the country?

'(4) What is the difference in wages for it?

'(5) Do they object to it altogether, or would they suggest its regulation and limitation?

'(6) Have they considered the probable effect of its abolition in bringing more hands into the town?

‘I do not know to what places such work is chiefly sent. You could ascertain this, and would then write to some capable incumbent of such a place and ask him to send me a report of the general effect which the system has on the village, and the probable results of its abolition. One or two such men as you think them capable. Ask them to address to me at the Vicarage, Knighton, at once.

‘If you would send me the result of your inquiries there I should be glad. . . . This is for a report to headquarters, where I am anxious to put the matter fully and fairly.’

To Sir Courtenay Boyle

‘April 9, 1895.

‘I have been spending most of my time to-day in getting up the question of country work. The masters are firm that they can see their way to no compromise. I have tried to get at the bottom of the matter, and it is generally what I told you before. The abolition of country work would perfect the organisation of the Union and leave the masters at the mercy of the men. This they will never agree to.

‘At present the position of the masters is very strong. The men are out of their calculations, this is the busiest time of the year, and they thought the Federation would break up through the inability of the smaller employers to hold out; but (1) the Federation has shown unexpected strength; (2) Public opinion has not been enlisted on the men’s side. The men cannot reasonably expect to win on the country work. I think they must withdraw; the question is *how*?

‘Let me explain, though perhaps you know, the importance of the question, not for the present but for the future. Shoe-work is divided into three main heads—the *clickers* who cut the upper leather, the *lasters* who make up the shoe into shape, and the *finishers*. Clickers and finishers need complicated machinery; but the work of the lasters, though done by this machinery to some degree, is not absolutely dependent on it. Simpler machinery that could be used even at home would suffice. At present the lasting is done in the factories; but the men know that this is *not absolutely necessary*. Further the lasters are the representatives of the oldest part of the transformed industry. They have the old traditions and are strongest in the Union. If the pressure of the Union was unreasonable, the masters could at a pinch withdraw some of the lasting to the country. Then the clickers and the finishers would be dependent on the country workers, and the strength of the Union would be broken.

‘Both sides see this, and they are fighting with reference

to this occult possibility in the future. The present is not of much moment : not much work goes into the country, and not much gain is made of it.

‘There is no claim made by the men that masters are acting contrary to the spirit of previous agreements : it is a new question, though it has long been simmering, and is now considered ripe for solution.

‘The work is sent out by carriers and brought back by them in carts : you will see that it cannot be much if it is so distributed. The men’s cry, “Work begun in Leicester to be finished in Leicester,” is like an attempt to build a great wall of China, and so be secure. If it were acted on it would also carry “Work begun in the country to be finished in the country”—*i.e.* that factories should be built in every place where work was done. This sounds plausible, but it is impossible.

‘I had a long talk with the manager of the great factory of the Co-operative Wholesale, which obeys Union rules, and pays Union wages. . . . This man is very intelligent, and has made a visit to the United States to see exactly what the competition was. He is of opinion that the surest way to secure lasting agreement would be that each side should depute two, and they should select an arbiter, who should go to America and look at things for themselves. He believes that only so could the workmen understand the conditions under which English trade has to be carried on.

‘You will see that the difficulty about the country work is not any actual grievance at present, but is the principle which underlies it. Only when the men feel they cannot win will they accept some compromise which leaves the masters’ position practically unchanged. As a master put it to me : “We cannot bind ourselves always to have all our eggs in one basket.” I do not see how they can. Of course some percentage of country work might be arranged : but this would be a barren victory for the men.’

To the Rev. Canon Stocks

‘Peterborough : April 15, 1895.

‘I think the masters are now rather too much up. Apparently they claim to decide for themselves what is necessary for the management of their business, and will not submit that point in any detail to arbitration. Surely some points might be submitted. Otherwise their claim deals a blow at Trades Unionism altogether. The men demand too much : the masters refuse too much. I am afraid the conference will break down unless some approach is made to an understanding. I have written to —— very gently. The only

thing to do is to indicate how things stand. Perhaps, if you see anyone, you would point out something of the sort. Opinions only prevail by cautious hints : the combatants learn from outside opinion.'

To Sir Courtenay Boyle

April 17, 1895.

'After meditating on your last letter I ventured to write to — to make two suggestions: (1) that the masters should try to find some definition of *management* which did not run too counter to the principles of *Trades Unionism*; (2) that on no account should the conference be broken off. I urged the great advantage of keeping it open, and adhering to the semblance of friendly discussion, however great might be the provocation to dismiss it.

'I enclose you his answer. You will see that on the last point he agrees with me. This is very important, and I hope it may encourage you to persevere in your arduous and thankless office.'

To the Rev. H. Orford (then in S. Africa)

'April 18, 1895.

'Leicester is altogether rent by the strike, which gives us all much anxiety, and is still far from an end. The matter is terribly complicated : the masters are resolute : the men are unreasonable : I fear the end will be a great deal of damage to the trade of the place. I struggle to do what I can for peace, but it is entirely a matter for expert opinion, and good intentions avail little. I was in Leicester all last week taking Holy Week services at St. John's Knighton. Things seemed to be going fairly well as far as the church is concerned.'

The difficulties in the way of a settlement which had at times seemed insuperable were at last overcome at a prolonged session of the conference between the representatives of masters and men, under the presidency of Sir Courtenay Boyle, in London on April 19.

To the Rev. Canon Stocks

'Peterborough : April 20, 1895.

'The news to-day is a great relief to us all, and we can now rejoice in the result, which seems likely to establish much better relations and to remove all causes of dispute to a proper tribunal. I think we may congratulate ourselves on the wise attitude taken by the public generally, and on the behaviour of the men.

'You remember that Sanders spoke of celebrating this then far-off peace by a thanksgiving service. It would be

a good thing if it were acceptable to those concerned. But the proposal should seem to emanate from the Mayor and the service should be municipal. Probably a Sunday afternoon would be best—next Sunday if possible. The non-conformists should join : perhaps you would ask one or two of the ministers their opinion ; one of them might read a lesson. There might be a procession from the municipal buildings. If men and masters would walk side by side it would be admirable. I would gladly walk between Ward and Inskip. But you will see how this can be arranged best, if indeed it can be arranged at all. I mean that I do not think a purely ecclesiastical ceremony would be worth much : that might be done in each church and chapel separately. I wish it to be, if possible, a united act : unless it is so taken up, it had better be dropped.'

The Bishop succeeded in keeping his part in helping to bring about an agreement entirely in the background, and his action was never referred to by the public press ; but Sir Courtenay Boyle wrote to him : ' My own efforts were largely helped by your information and counsel, which enabled me to see where danger lay and where safety was to be sought ; ' and one of the oldest of the Leicester clergy, Canon Vaughan, wrote, ' We are rejoicing beyond words to describe in the prospect of social peace. Rightly or wrongly, I cannot help tracing your Lordship's good hand in the matter, and, as a Leicester man to the core, I most heartily thank you in the name of Leicester.' Canon Stocks says : ' He helped the leaders on both sides to settle the dispute, not only by being a good listener to the statements of their different points of view and the arguments in support of them, but by suggesting at the right moment the method of intervention and the choice of a reference. But the action taken at the critical moment, with such good result, would have been impossible if he had not previously in many ways won at least a certain amount of confidence in many quarters.'

It was impossible not to feel anxious as to how Leicester would calm down and loyally accept the terms of the agreement, but on July 9 the Bishop was able to write to Mr. Orford, ' Leicester since the strike has been going ahead, steadily making up for lost time.'

Throughout the contest, the Bishop had felt and shown

great sympathy with the men, but he had distrusted their judgment, and had not felt confidence in the wisdom of their leaders. He understood how industrial questions were complicated by international competition, and saw the need for expert knowledge. He felt that the real difficulty was to get the ordinary man to recognise the value and importance of that knowledge, or to have any means of discovering whether it was possessed by the leaders whose brave words attracted him.

To Mr. Wigham Richardson

‘ May 10, 1895.

‘ The boot strike kept me very busy for a long time. I worked quietly to bring those concerned to the point; and the success exceeded my expectations. The worst of the position taken up by the English working-man is its entire insularity. He regards “foreign competition” as a bogey invented to scare him. I believe that one of the best things masters could do would be to offer to pay the expenses of two of the Union leaders to go abroad with two of their own number and judge for themselves the conditions and results of the trade they were interested in, on the spots where it was most threatening to England.¹ Surely a report from them on this subject would be very sobering to wild speculations.

‘ But this is a large proposal. To return to smaller things, I am glad to hear that you are all pretty well. We are all growing older, I suppose, in body, though we need not grow older in mind. I certainly cannot complain of any temptation to rust out.’

The Bishop in his frequent lectures to different organisations of working-men tried to enlarge their minds and train their judgment by lifting them into a bigger world. His subjects were generally historical, but they were very varied: the Armada, Common Sense, Carthage, Benedictine monasteries, are among them. However remote the subject, he showed its connexion with modern times by his illustrations and allusions, and never failed to bring home to his hearers the continuity of history nor to give them some practical lessons to carry away. He would lecture to the people, says Bishop Thicknesse, ‘in his best manner, give them information good enough and conveyed agreeably enough for princes, and when expressions

¹ Mr. Wigham Richardson writes July 2, 1901, that the suggestion has been acted on in the engineering trade, and with immensely satisfactory results.

and noble conclusions fell from what he was saying, such as were least expected from a bishop, the faint and almost timid "hear, hear" that escaped the surprised listener was really as good as a play. His sympathetic fun and humour got hold of his hearers through some point in common with them, and enabled him to establish the power of influencing them. It is remarkable that I cannot recollect any strong feeling of objection showing itself in the papers or otherwise against the Church from anything the Bishop had said on church topics. His sojourn in the Diocese greatly disarmed the opposition and won the good-will of the disaffected. As was quite truly said and answered, "Who were his enemies?" "He had none."

CHAPTER V

THE CORONATION AT MOSCOW

THE varied work of the year 1894 was a striking manifestation of the extent and versatility of the Bishop's powers. Early in the year the fifth volume of the 'History of the Papacy' was published, and later on appeared his Hulsean Lectures and his Primary Charge, perhaps in their different ways the fullest expression he ever made of his experience, his thought and the result of his studies. In the course of the same year he gave 170 different sermons and addresses: he began one of his most illuminating historical writings, the Life of Elizabeth, and he made himself known in the London world by his brilliant speech at the Academy banquet. All the time the regular work of his diocese was his chief care and his first thought. He was gaining that understanding of its social conditions which enabled him to help with such wise judgment in bringing the dispute in the boot and shoe trade to a peaceful issue, and was every day winning more completely the confidence of clergy and laity alike.

Towards the end of 1894, on learning that the proposed new Manchester and Sheffield Railway would pass through much of his diocese, he made arrangements for the care of the spiritual needs of the navvies.

To the Rev. Canon Stocks

'October 22, 1894.

'Thank you very much for your steps about the Navvies Mission. I have written to my brethren of Oxford, Southwell and Worcester to suggest that they put me in command of the whole scheme so far as the clerical superintendent is concerned. If they agree, then we might have the outlines of a plan, and all the parishes concerned would fall in.'

'October 24, 1894.

'I enclose you letters from the Bishops of Oxford and Worcester. I have not yet heard from Southwell. . . . If he

writes like the others, the organisation will be joint, under one superintendent, whom I will appoint, but who will devise a working scheme which he will submit to the other bishops, taking care in each case to make all possible use of the incumbent, if he is willing to do anything, and respecting his rights. But the first step is the financial step. This must be done in each section by a local committee, whose chairmen may constitute a central committee, over which I am president. Is that the sort of shape which the whole scheme may formally assume ?'

The work of the mission was satisfactorily organised with the help of the Navy Mission Society. The Bishop took much interest in it, and showed his sense of his indebtedness to the central society by holding a meeting for it at the Palace and speaking at its meetings in London.

On January 10, 1895, he took part in the services and meetings held in Trinity Square and in the church of All Hallows, London, in commemoration of Archbishop Laud. In the afternoon he gave a lecture in the church on 'Laud's position in the history of the English Church.'¹ He said that his object was not to eulogise Laud, but to explain the task which he undertook and the difficulties which beset him. He asserted Laud's unfailing claim to the homage of English churchmen because of what he did to fix the character of the English Church, but he made no attempt to disguise Laud's errors and shortcomings, though he claimed that all might unite in admiring his zeal, his devotion, his courage, his conscientiousness.

Early in 1895 he was invited to Sandringham for the first time.

To his daughter Lucia

'In Convocation at London : February 6, 1895.

'I have not written to you since you went back, which is very naughty ; but I have been busy and feeble. I never told you of my visit to the Prince of Wales ; he was very genial, and had hosts of men staying there : amongst them Lord Grey and Dr. Jameson, who administers Mashonaland, with whom I had many talks about the Mission. He tells me that the new bishop is quite the right man, with large experience of the colonists in Africa. I also saw the Duke

¹ Published in *Lectures and Addresses*.

of York's baby : think of that. The Duke of York is a very nice youth, full of interest and ready to talk about anything. . . . Everybody was very nice, but there were too many of them. I preached a sermon which they seemed to like, in the church which lies in the park close by. There was deep snow as we pottered about in the afternoon and looked at dogs and horses. Since then I have been wandering about the diocese, doing all sorts of things that have to be done before I go abroad. Now I am in London sitting in Convocation, where a debate is going on about nothing in particular. In this weather I wish I was going to stay at home? . . . The Bishop of Lincoln is sitting opposite to me, and has just dropped the ink all over his white robes in front, and looks very distraught in consequence.

‘We sit and write letters when the debate is not amusing : now we are prorogued for lunch, when we eat ham sandwiches, in a room like a railway refreshment bar.’

After this he went to Sandringham every year ; he much enjoyed his visits, and met there many interesting people. At a later visit he made great friends with the royal children. He had a tremendous romp with little Prince Edward, then four or five years old, and at last perched him standing with one of his legs on each of his shoulders, from which perilous height the descent was made by a somersault, a performance which the Bishop had often practised with his own children. The little Prince was delighted, and came up again and again to have the exciting experience repeated, whilst the bystanders were a little alarmed lest these wild romps might lead to some accident, not knowing how safe long experience with children had made the Bishop.

We started for Rome with our eldest daughter in the bitter frost which held all Europe from the middle of February to the end of March, and saw nothing but snow till we crossed the mountains behind Genoa. We left our daughter at Rome and went further south to some of the more remote places which he loved.

To his daughter Lucia

‘Cava dei Tirreni : February 19, 1895.

‘I am writing in a lovely spot, to which we came this afternoon from Rome. The sun shone on us, but the air freezes and icicles hang on every side. In Rome yesterday there was the curious sight of frozen fountains with a column

of water all blocked up by frost. . . . Rome was rather a bore, because people knew that I was there and called on me. Though I did not return their calls, I still had a sense of responsibility which prevented the feeling of a holiday. Moreover at all spare moments and for most meals we were with the Balzanis, and it is not my notion of a holiday to be always talking. Further I gave two lectures which required me to be thinking and trying to improve my mind. Now that is all over ; we are in a little town of the most charming situation. . . . Its glory is its monastery, which is somewhere up in the mountains and is one of the most famous in Italy. It is especially famous for its archives : which are very large, and its library is of great importance. Perhaps I shall wander up the mountain to see them. Beatrice was beginning, I think, yesterday to find her legs a little in Rome, and to begin to enjoy it. At first it is disappointing and bewildering. The Balzani children are amazingly grown up. . . . It is a comfort, you know, to talk to someone who gets through sentences straight, and does not say "you know" and "what is it?" When this power of conversation comes to a child, it is quite impressive : and I was certainly greatly impressed by them.

'I suppose it is never going to thaw any more. Of course it is absolutely unheard of that there should be snow or ice in Italy at all : and to have it in the middle of February is quite terrible. The people are perfectly amazed and do not know what to make of it. . . . I am already sorry to think that ten days of the holiday have gone.'

From Cava we went on to Pæstum, Salerno and Amalfi, and thence by the magnificent coast road to Sorrento, and after a few days there and at Naples went to Monte Cassino. At the little inn at Cassino, the village at the foot of the mountain crowned by the great monastery, we spent an evening of the kind which he particularly enjoyed. He always travelled incognito without any servant and in ordinary, rather shabby, clerical attire. There was no one else staying at the little inn, but in the evening we heard sounds of music, and presently the waiter came and told us that the landlady was giving a party and she hoped that we would join it. So we were conducted upstairs and found the landlady, a lively, handsome young widow, receiving her guests, two or three middle-aged women, and eight or nine men. The party apparently was to be a dance, and the landlady, the one good

dancer amongst the women, danced with all the men in turn, and was most amiable and lively ; the people were all absolutely simple and friendly, and treated us with the utmost courtesy and kindness. We danced with them, talked with them, and shared in the very mild refreshments handed round in the middle of the party, sour wine, green apples, and hard biscuits ; and we parted from our landlady next morning like old friends.

The exceptional severity of the weather still continued and forced us to leave the mountains and return to Rome.

To Mr. Robert Bridges

‘ Peterborough : March 19, 1895.

‘ Italy was cold, and my wanderings were cut short by snow. I had meant to wander in by-ways but was driven back to Rome. . . . Rome is too big, too civilised and too full of Americans to be a real holiday. I more and more seek peace and quiet. . . . Now I am beset with work and all my diocese is engaged in a strike, so I shall have a high time of it, and be abused for what I do and for what I do not do.’

The boot and shoe strike had begun just before we got back to Peterborough.

On Whitsunday, June 2, he preached before the University at Oxford, on ‘ Christian Unity.’ He never considered that organic unity was to be looked for in our day as a practical possibility, but believed that the present call was to cultivate that temper which would make for the ‘ unity of the Spirit.’ He said, in this sermon, that we must beware both of over-estimating and of under-estimating our differences. Progress towards unity would best be assured if existing differences were carefully defined, and the reasons on which they are founded clearly understood. Every religious body should strongly and persistently assert its fundamental basis, should try to live on its positive and not its negative teaching, should be judged by its own contents and not by its criticism of other systems. He ended by pleading that all would admit that they had something to learn and something to teach and would seek humility and fair-mindedness.¹

On June 18 he delivered the Rede lecture at Cambridge.

¹ Published in *The Heritage of the Spirit*.

taking as his subject the 'Early Renaissance in England.'¹ His study of the Elizabethan times had repeatedly brought before him the consideration of the beginnings of the New Learning in England, and though he owned that he had attempted the impossible in trying to condense such a subject into an hour's lecture, he hoped at least to have aroused some interest in the history of scholarship, which in his opinion was too generally disregarded. Some twenty years before, he had said to me that the renaissance in England was a splendid subject which still needed its historian.

On the same day he also spoke at a meeting about a memorial to Sir John Seeley, and recalled the characteristics of his former colleague :

'I always used to feel that there was nothing more striking than to see Seeley walking along the streets, meditating by himself. He caught your eye, and immediately his face lit up ; with that characteristic short quick step he would cross the road, and at once put aside all that he had been thinking about, and talk with you about something in which he thought you were particularly interested. In was this power of ready sympathy which gave his conversation in society such charm. He was not talking because he must talk, but he was talking because you led him to talk.'

He spoke of how Seeley stimulated his pupils and inspired them 'with deference and respect—deference that was due to simplicity, and the respect that was won only by straightforwardness.' He had shown the supreme art of the man of letters, because 'he seized the salient points of his subject ; he studied them to the full ; he made them quite clear to his own mind ; he consumed all the chips of his workshop ; he got rid of all the traces of his toil.' Then he spoke out : 'careful rather to make his conclusion clear than to state the exact steps by which he himself had arrived at it.'

On Tuesday, June 18, the Bishop gave the addresses at the devotional meeting of bishops at Lambeth. Archbishop Benson writes about these in his diary : 'Bishop of Peterborough gave four excellent addresses on the *κρυπτός άνθρωπος τῆς καρδίας*, as a scientifically true idea, and the one important spiritual fact in us, our personality, and three

¹ Published in *Lectures and Addresses*.

on St. Peter—very clever, searching, epigrammatic.' Bishop Westcott spoke of them as 'glowing and powerful.'¹

At the end of August we spent a fortnight in Normandy with our two elder boys. We began with Caen, and then walked to many of the wonderful village churches in the Calvados district. The Bishop's delight in architecture was ever increasing. He judged it the first of the arts, though the last to be properly appreciated. Painting, he considered, was the first to attract, then sculpture, and last of all architecture, the most learned of the arts, yet at the same time eminently a popular art, for it was the most clear and definite way in which ideas could be expressed. He made a church tell him its own story. First he walked round it outside, noticing every little detail and tracing the growth of walls and roof. On going inside he went at once to the transepts, saying that it was there that the history of the building could best be discerned. Each visit to France made him more convinced of the pre-eminence of the French in architecture, and he was full of plans for future journeys which should make him better acquainted with the treasures of France. The last days of our ramble were spent at Étretat, where he wrote the presidential address for his diocesan conference.

On his return to England he preached before the meeting of the British Association at Ipswich. He spoke of the processes by which knowledge is gained, and said that they must be the same whatever kind of knowledge was pursued. 'The pursuit of knowledge teaches reverence and humility; it requires for its success, seriousness, sobriety, a sense of limitation, above all a sense of relationship and universal truth.' To him no grasp of knowledge seemed possible without a conception of the unity of truth. All knowledge becomes coherent 'by the revelation of God contained in Scripture. That revelation is, like all others, progressive, for it is the revelation of a Person, the Lord Jesus Christ, and that Person is the centre of all other revelations, the point to which they run.'² These words express the central belief of the Bishop's life, the belief by which all his ideas and endeavours become coherent.

¹ Published in *The Mind of St. Peter and other Sermons*.

² Published in *The Heritage of the Spirit*.

In the end of September the diocesan conference met in Peterborough. In his presidential address¹ he spoke amongst other things of the Welsh Disestablishment Bill, and of the necessity for accurate teaching about the Church, which must go on 'till we have placed the Church beyond the reach of party politics altogether. This can be done by showing historically its close connexion with the national life of England. It must be done also practically, by showing that the existence of a national Church makes provision for the spiritual needs of all; while it does not interfere with full liberty of combination on the part of those who prefer other forms of worship.' He spoke of the signs of the universal growth in Christian sympathy and forbearance, and said 'For myself I would thankfully bear witness to the personal friendliness of nonconformists, both ministers and people, throughout my diocese.'

In the discussion that followed, he said that now when there was no question of a direct attack upon the Church was the time for the clergy to teach the position of the Church, its history, its meaning, its importance, and its connexion with national life. But 'in many cases neither the clergy nor anybody in the parish knew very much about the Church. The clergy took the position of the Church for granted, but they could not expect the people always to take that position for granted.'

He had been asked to speak at the Norwich Church Congress on the National Church:

To Dr. Jessopp

'Peterborough: August 5, 1895.

'Is my Church Congress paper to be part of an historical series which you begin and Gwatkin continues? I mean is the idea that you establish the national character of the Church of England: Gwatkin shows that it was not changed at the Reformation? Then am I to come between you and show that the continuity was not broken by *the Reformation* developments, and to fit on to yours by the assertion that, such as you show it to be at the first, such it remains?'

'Peterborough: August 7, 1895.

'I am glad to find that your opinion agrees with mine. We have to make the best of it. If you show the indepen-

¹ Published in *The Church and the Nation*.

dent origin of the Church of England, I will go on something like this. The Church in England accepted the papal jurisdiction for sufficient reasons, and repudiated it for still more sufficient reasons. It was never merged in the Church of Rome. The middle ages revelled in ideal theories—*e.g.* the Empire did not absorb the English State. The English Church submitted appeals to the Pope, disputed papal legates, received papal bulls just as far as it liked : sheltered itself under the Crown when convenient, finally allowed the Crown to resume all that the Pope claimed. Would these be the right lines? In a short paper it is useless to get lost in details, or to *prove* ; one can only *assert*.'

Besides reading this paper the Bishop preached in Norwich Cathedral on the Sunday morning after the Congress, and went the same day to Cambridge to address undergraduates.

To his son Walter at Marlborough College

‘Peterborough : October 18, 1895.

‘ . . . Since leaving Norwich I have been twice to Cambridge, once on Sunday to preach to the undergraduates on the “Imitatio” : and yesterday to open Selwyn Chapel. I saw Lucia and Cuthbert both times. They seemed very happy. Cuthbert’s rooms are very spacious and look very nice : he seems to be taking quite seriously to College life, and to enjoy it. But before he was an old boy : now he is a very young man. Do you understand the difference? There is something in the notion of a “Fresher.” He has grown old in school experience : now he has a new kind of experience, in which he is rather awkward : and the awkwardness goes through him. Don’t tell him I said so. Lucia has got over that period now : the second year is always the period of advance.

‘Yesterday we had a great service at Selwyn, and the Archbishop preached a sermon. The Warden of Keble was there, and multitudes of people whom I knew. I am actually going to Cambridge again to-morrow to open a training college, but my visit has to be very brief. I have had no time this week for writing my letters, and have written so many this morning that my writing goes anyhow. Love to Oswin. God bless you both.’

That autumn we spent six days in Northumberland, staying at Howick with Lord Grey, and at Fallodon with Sir Edward Grey.

To his son Walter

‘Peterborough : November 5, 1895.

‘We had a very pleasant time in Northumberland, only everybody was attending meetings, and even Embleton indulged in a bazaar. I felt as if peace was not to be found within the limits of England, and was more than ever convinced that even the shortest holiday can only be found beyond the seas. I am going to lecture at St. Paul’s Cathedral on Friday, and on Saturday go to Sandringham to keep the Prince of Wales’ birthday. It is rather awful to preach him a birthday sermon. I suppose I ought to feel highly honoured . . . I had two functions to perform yesterday on a dismal day ; they were not very cheerful. Next week mother and I go to Leicester, which is severe.’

In this week besides attending the meeting of East Anglian bishops in London, at Bishop Festing’s house, lecturing in St. Paul’s Cathedral on Grosseteste, and going to Sandringham on the Saturday, the Bishop consecrated a cemetery, instituted a vicar in his new church, attended a meeting and preached to a gathering of the Young Men’s Friendly Society at Leicester. The following week was spent at Leicester, given up to meetings and services, with an expedition to London to give a brilliant and learned address to the Church Historical Society, on ‘Dispensations,’¹ and give his second lecture in St. Paul’s Cathedral.² He wrote to Professor Collins about these lectures ‘I am glad to think that my treatment of Grosseteste was in your opinion useful. “The unity of the Church” in the past sounds so well, that it is worth while to see how it worked out.’

He received this autumn a request from some Northamptonshire gentlemen that he would allow his portrait to be painted and presented to him :

‘November 25, 1895. .

‘Dear Mr. Oldroyd,—I am very sensible of the high honour that you and others propose to confer upon me, and I am quite sure that Mr. Harris Brown will do more than justice to a very unsatisfactory subject.’

Mr. Harris Brown, the artist chosen, came to stay at the Palace, and the Bishop spent many December days at home

¹ Published in *The Church and the Nation*.

² Published in *Lectures and Addresses*.

to enable him to get on with his work, days which the visitors to the Palace as well as the artist remember with delight. The process of sitting naturally bored the Bishop, and people were urged to come and amuse him by talking to him. Every possible subject grave and gay was discussed, and the artist at times found the talk so interesting that it was difficult to proceed with his work. As he said afterwards, 'The Bishop gave me some of the golden hours of my life.' The Bishop was painted in his purple cassock sitting in a carved oak chair which had been a treasured possession since his Oxford days, against a background of his bookcases with their white parchment folios. The portrait gives an admirable impression of him at his most genial and intimate moments.¹

In 1896 he first took his seat in the House of Lords :

To L. C.

'115 St. George's Road, S.W.: February 12, 1896.

'I had a hard day yesterday, as I did not get here till 10.30. I found that trains were bad. However, I had a useful time at Thornton and did much business. To-day I have been busy all day : went to service at ten, opened the Church House, then lunched with Gore, went to the House of Lords, took my seat, which is a ludicrous process, but not so ludicrous as for lay-lords, of whom I saw six introduced. It was like a show in a circus. Then I heard some debate, to the end of Rosebery's speech, when I retired with a headache.'

It was in 1896 that he finished his monograph on Queen Elizabeth. It was one of the magnificent series of illustrated biographies brought out by Messrs. Boussod & Valadon. He was so familiar with the Elizabethan period that it was a recreation to him in the midst of his other work to write this book. As he said afterwards : 'I only wrote the book because I had been lecturing on the subject at Cambridge, and when the proposal was made, I wrote it for my own amusement.' It is because it was written with such ease, out of the fulness of his knowledge, that this study of Elizabeth's character has proved so fascinating. Very soon

¹ A replica of this portrait has been painted by Mr. Harris Brown for Emmanuel College. The original will ultimately be added to the collection of portraits at the Palace, Peterborough.

there was a demand for the book in a form which would make it accessible to a larger number of readers.

The proofs of the 'Elizabeth' followed us during a holiday spent in Algeria early in 1896. On this journey we explored much of the mountain scenery, taking long drives of several days.

To his daughter Lucia

‘Bougie : February 25, 1896.

‘. . . We have just arrived at this place after a drive of two days, quite the loveliest drive I ever took. We went off for a day's journey in the train from Algiers to a place called Sétif, 3,600 feet high. You may imagine it was rather cold there on a wet night, in which we arrived. Next day the weather was not much better when we started; and soon after leaving it poured with rain and the wind howled. We would not have the carriage shut, but kept the front open and covered ourselves with waterproofs. We mounted higher up on the desolate and treeless country, till we were in a pelting snowstorm, which hit one's face and stung terribly. I had to lend my luckless driver a pair of gloves, he looked so miserable. Presently we began to leave the open plain and go down a slight valley which gave some shelter. Storks were walking in the fields and ravens flopping about looking monstrous. As we went down the valley a few trees began to appear, and presently the landscape looked like a bit of the Scotch Highlands on a good Scotch rainy day. The valley grew more decided when we stopped at a roadside inn for lunch. In a miserable little place they speedily produced four courses of food and dessert¹; and we drank coffee to warm ourselves a little. . . . At half-past four we reached a little village where we were to stay the night. There the splendour of the road began. We were at the entrance of a gorge of surpassing grandeur. The banks rose sheer 1,500 feet; and were quite close to one another. The road had been cut out with the greatest difficulty in the side of the rocks: before it was made no one had been able to go up the gorge, not even the Arabs. We walked down it as long as the light lasted. It was magnificent. At every turn you seemed entirely shut in, with no way out before or behind. Above were flocks of eagles wheeling in the sky: below were coveys of blue rock pigeons, whose colouring looked brilliant

¹ Throughout this journey we were much struck by the resource and capacity of the French colonists. The landladies in the roughest and most remote wayside inns know how to make one comfortable and provide meals nicely cooked.

against the dark foliage.¹ For the gorge was covered with trees, all green and fresh . . . beautiful trees of soft foliage, olive and cork, oaks and palms, and shrubs of every sort. . . . To-day we started and drove six miles through the gorge. When we left it we saw the great snowy mountains circling it on every side. . . . Suddenly we came upon the sea, with a great line of white breakers rolling in. We followed it some eighteen miles till we came here, a town on a bold rock jutting out into the sea. . . . Here we are quite warm and balmy. We took a walk in the most brilliant moonlight. I never saw so clear a sky. You could see that the moon was on a different plane from the stars, an effect I never saw in England. . . . You will see how wonderfully varied our journey was, grander and larger than anything in Europe, every part of it quite excellent in its way, and made picturesque by the Arabs and their costume, and their queer villages which look like rubbish heaps. This part of Algeria is called Kabylia, and the Kabyles are a race by themselves, not the Arab invaders, but the Berbers who were the original people of North Africa whom the Romans and Carthaginians found there. They are fine fellows, very amiable. I am so delighted with this experience that I have opened negotiations for another drive of three days into the central highlands of Kabylia. I do not know if we will find any place to sleep the first night; but it will be sport if the weather will keep up. However, I cannot leave Bougie for two days more, it is too nice.'

The projected drive of three days was accomplished through wonderful mountain scenery, under the charge of an Arab driver. After that we went further west and spent our last days at Tlemçen. Much though he was interested in Algeria, the Bishop missed the charm of the intercourse with the people which he enjoyed so much in his Italian rambles, and he also felt the want of the continuous historic interest which adds so much to the delight of Italy. The absence of family life, the seclusion of the women, the want of any visible religious life amongst the people also affected him disagreeably. But the wild beauty of the mountains and the quite new effects of nature which we experienced made the journey most enjoyable: 'I am quite enchanted with the beauties of Africa,' he wrote from Tlemçen; 'the colours are

¹ This is the gorge called Chabet-el-Akhira.

surprising, especially at sunset ; this place has the most gorgeous effects of colour.'

We got back to Peterborough on March 23. On April 29, in accordance with a request received from the Westminster District Committee for Church Defence, he lectured at the Church House on 'The Church in the reign of Elizabeth.'¹ The demand for tickets was so great that the lecture had to be held in the great hall of the Church House, which was filled with a large and distinguished audience. Next day he lectured for the same committee in the evening to a large working-class audience on 'Church and State.' He was by no means given to unreasoning optimism, but he was never inclined to over-rate the difficulties of the present, and often said that men at all periods thought that they lived in momentous times and judged their own difficulties to be exceptional. He concluded this lecture by saying that 'never was a time in English history when Church and State worked in such thorough harmony for the public good as our own days.'

About this time he was asked to his great surprise whether he would be willing to go to Moscow to represent the English Church at the Imperial Coronation. This proposal had been under consideration for some time. On December 27, 1895, the Archbishop wrote to the Bishop of Winchester, 'It is very right and Catholic if the Czar should entertain the idea of inviting the English Church by representation to be present at his coronation. . . . Good might come of it. . . . For the reasons you mention and others the Archbishop could not go. But I should be very glad if the Queen approves in the first instance to send the Bishop of Peterborough as our representative and accredit him formally in that capacity. . . . I do not think he ought to be invited personally. No step would be gained in good will between the Churches, only personal friendliness expressed.'

The Bishop heard nothing of the proposal till four months later.

The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Bishop of Peterborough

'Florence : April 15, 1896.

'I have a letter from Lord Salisbury, enclosing one from Cimiez,² to tell me that it is thought desirable that one of the

¹ Published in *Lectures and Addresses*.

² The Queen was then staying at Cimiez.

English bishops should attend the coronation of the Czar at Moscow.

‘It was the wish of the Czar I heard some time ago, and Lord Salisbury thinks such a mission may do a great deal of good spiritually and politically. Spiritually I believe, politically I hope, it will.

‘I am now requested to depute a bishop. The Bishop of Winchester, as Prelate of the Garter, would be our ordinary official in such a case; but I have ascertained privately that it would be very undesirable on account of his health.

‘This being the case, I have no doubt whatever that you are the right person to go. And I hope that you will do so. It would be a real representation of the Church. I need not enlarge on the hopes that surround such personal intercourse. . . . You will know best whom it will be well for you to see at the Foreign Office before going, and what letters you would require. You would no doubt be kindly willing to bear one from me to the Metropolitan or proper dignitary. Probably you know Mr. Birkbeck, who is intimate in these Russian circles.’

To the Bishop of Winchester (Dr. Randall Davidson)

‘Peterborough: April 19, 1896.

‘My dear Bishop,—I am heartily sorry that I should be called upon to replace you on an occasion for which you were exceptionally fitted. The proposal came to me so unexpectedly that at present I only see the inconvenience. However I must do my best and obey orders; and I trust I shall enjoy it and appreciate it when I am there. It is certainly a significant and encouraging fact that on such an occasion there should be a wish for a representative of the English Church. Such a thing augurs well for the future—in which my hope is for the abolition of exclusiveness and the interchange of ideas, rather than for any formal schemes of what is called re-union—Russia has much to learn from personal contact with other systems, and we have always been ready to learn.

‘I shall be in London for Convocation. I am staying at Lambeth. I want all the advice and information that I can obtain, and shall be most desirous of a talk with you. I can only say again how sorry I am that you are prevented from going.’

From the Bishop of Winchester to the Bishop of Peterborough

‘. . . Putting aside my selfishness, I cannot but rejoice that you are going, for I know how you will more than any

other of us all appreciate and understand the occasion, and we shall look forward intensely to hearing its details from you. I trust nothing will intervene to prevent you from going.

Though the Bishop felt this request distinctly embarrassing, coming as it did so soon after his return from a holiday, and when he was full of engagements of every kind, he had no hesitation about doing as was desired. I could not accompany him. As the bishops of the Russian Church are not married, it would have been out of place for an English bishop on a state occasion to appear with a wife, so for the first time he prepared to go on a long journey alone. There was little time for all the necessary arrangements. He had to provide for his work during his absence, and to hold many interviews with official persons in London in order to obtain instructions. The Prince of Wales summoned him to Marlborough House, and had a long talk with him about his mission. The Archbishop was interested in every detail. He wrote that 'the Bishop ought to go in the smartest clothes the law allows. No possible person could object to a cope, and the late Lord Selborne maintained that mitres *might*, and probably *ought* to, be worn by English bishops at their functions. This I think would be right.'

As the Bishop's own cope was not suitable, one of the Westminster coronation copes of crimson velvet and gold was borrowed for him, and he took his own mitre and pastoral staff. It was decided that he should travel with Mr. W. J. Birkbeck, who was going to Moscow for the coronation, and whose knowledge of Russia and of the Russian language would make him an invaluable companion. The Russian authorities made everything easy. The Russian Ambassador, M. de Staal, said that all Russians would be delighted at such a distinguished representative of the English episcopate being sent, and that he would be a *persona gratissima* both to the Emperor and to the ecclesiastical authorities. The following are extracts from his letters to me :

' Moscow, May 18, 1896.

' At 7.30 we reached Warsaw. We found the troops drawn up and a band playing in honour of the Grand Duke of Oldenburg, who was with us. There in the scuffle Birkbeck

chived the station master, who put us into our carriage. Here we reached magnificence. The only thing that could not be avoided was the dust.

‘Though we had double windows, a fine sand found its way in, and covered everything, and an attendant came at intervals and swept up. Our train was entirely for guests of the Emperor; there were only about twenty people in it. . . .

‘We reached Moscow in a heavy rain: the army was there to greet the Grand Duke, and we had to scramble out through them. . . .

‘No sooner was I there than the English chaplain came to ask me to preach on Sunday, which I agreed to do. . . . I changed into decent attire and called on Pobiedonostzeff,¹ but he was at dinner at 5.30. The rain had ceased a little and I went for a walk to the Kremlin. It was dull and things looked ugly, but the sight was very impressive: a mass of palaces, churches and monasteries on a hill above the river. The effect was marred by the preparations for the coronation: great wooden stages erected over all possible places. Moscow is a big place, very difficult at first to find one’s way about. I am not staying in the main house of the Embassy, I am glad to say, but in a second house which is reserved for bachelors. This is much more comfortable and chummy. . . . There are a number of young men whom I enjoy talking to. The attachés are all very kind to me, and take no end of pains. Birkbeck seems to place himself at my disposal. I shall let myself be run contentedly.’

‘May 19.

‘This place is so turned upside down, and everybody is so busy, and I can speak no Russian—so that, on the whole, I can only obey. . . . The whole thing seems to me more and more ridiculous, and I keep on asking myself what I am doing. But I will tell you my day in detail. . . . I was invaded by Birkbeck before I had finished breakfast. First we went to the Embassy and saw Sir N. O’Connor. . . . Then we drove off to find Pobiedonostzeff, who was at the Synod. . . . Nobody was in, and we collapsed into visiting a church, in which I learned something of their ritual. It is most extraordinary to see the peasants in the streets doing

¹ M. Pobiedonostzeff had been Alexander III.’s tutor, and doubtless had a great deal to do with the development of that Emperor’s strongly ‘national’ ideas. He was made Chief Procurator of the Holy Synod towards the end of Alexander II.’s reign, and had an enormous influence on the Government of Russia during the whole of Alexander III.’s reign, and may be said to have shaped the internal policy of Russia.

their devotions. There are eikons¹ outside : a man will stand before each, cross himself, and genuflect three times, say a prayer, and then pass on to the next. So they were in the church, going on from eikon to eikon ; they are all of old Byzantine type, and each one follows an approved model in design : thus they have names, the Vladimir Mother of God, the Khazan Mother of God, and so on.

‘ After lunch we went to the Kremlin and found Sanitscheff, the Emperor’s confessor, a nice old man of seventy, who talked to me in German. He is dean of the royal chapels, and has them under his care : there are in the palace itself about ten. He took my arm, and showed us over the palace : very splendid rooms, with lovely wooden floors, inlaid in patterns, floriated. On leaving him we went to Pobiedonostzeff, whom we found at home. He was a thin old man over seventy, more like a Frenchman than a Russian, with a thin face and large spectacles, clearly as acute as possible, and a diplomatist above all things. He was very pleasant and most kind, talked about all sorts of things in a general way, and gave me a German book about the coronation. I certainly thought him a great man in his way, and hope I may see more of him. We came back to tea, and I found in my room a touching present of bread and salt and a spoon from the lady who owns our house. Of course I had to pay a call and acknowledge her greeting.’

‘ May 20.

‘ I went off this morning to see the Patriarch and present a letter from the Archbishop. He was a venerable man, magnificently attired in purple velvet. He spoke only Russian, and communications had to pass through Birkbeck. We were with him for an hour, at the end of which he presented me with an eikon with great solemnity. He kissed me on both cheeks, and we kissed one another’s hands. The interview was quite successful, I think. I was dressed in my Convocation robes and tried to look magnificent. We afterwards tried to find some other metropolitans, and failed.’

The Bishop records in a notebook his interview with the Patriarch Gennadius, Archbishop of Petersburg.

‘ Birkbeck translated the Archbishop’s letter. Patriarch expressed his satisfaction at such a friendly and affectionate expression of sympathy, and hoped that intercourse might lead to a better understanding between the Churches : the English Church was not understood in Russia.

¹ Sacred Pictures.

‘*Bishop of P*: Nor the Russian Church in England. There is much in common.

‘*Patriarch*: Asked if we acknowledged Seven Sacraments, understood that we drew a difference between two, necessary for all men, and those only used by some.

‘I explained our definition of two only as generally necessary to salvation.

‘*Patriarch*: Therefore you do not exclude ordination from Sacraments. There is great interest in Russia about your Apostolical Succession.

‘*Bishop of P*: We have no doubt about it.

‘*Patriarch*: In the consecration of Parker, one bishop consecrated under the old ritual.

‘*Bishop of P*: Two.

‘*Patriarch*: That was important.

‘*Bishop of P*: We do not think so. The change in the ritual observed did not touch the essence of the rite. It was merely translation into English and simplification. All else remained the same.

‘The Patriarch took note of the view.

‘I explained the difference between Church of England and Church of Rome in attempt to get rid of Roman additions: referred to our Convocation Prayer.

‘*Patriarch*: Cordially approved of expression “tyrannus papalis.” Pseudo-Isidorian decretals in eyes of Romanists above Scripture.

‘Conversation then about Bishop Wilkinson’s visit, and comments made in English press: evidently very touchy on this point.

‘I explained political opposition to Church: everything done by a bishop sure to be commented on: but this not view of Church, but of a party.

‘*Patriarch*: referred to a suggestion of Bishop Wilkinson that a Greek bishop should attend Lambeth Conference.

‘*Bishop of P*: Conference was a meeting of our bishops for the business of the Church: would be glad of any mark of sympathy.

‘*Patriarch*: evidently desirous of this in some shape. Finally Patriarch said that he would lay the letter before the Holy Synod, who would return an answer. Gave me an eikon of St. Panteleëmon, the Unmercenary One, as a Saint before the division of the Churches.¹

¹ St. Panteleëmon was one of the class of Eastern Saints known as ‘unmercenary’ because they were men who gave aid to the poor without being paid. The great Russian monastery on Mount Athos is dedicated to him.

‘He further expressed his great pleasure at hearing that the Queen had used in her chapel the dirge of Alexander III. The unity of the Royal families was a tie to bring nations and churches together.’

‘May 23.

‘On Wednesday afternoon I paid calls and saw the Metropolitan of Kieff, who was not very impressive and did not talk about much. At seven o’clock we went to a service in the big Cathedral of the Saviour, and I saw the beginning of vespers with a large congregation who had come to pray for the Emperor, and would go on from 7 till 10.30. The ceremonial and the singing was very fine. You know the churches have an iconostasis, a huge chancel screen with gates shut before the altar. Some of the service is sung by a deacon outside, some by the priest inside, and then at times there is an *Entrance*—i.e. a procession from inside which marks a division. Then I came back and dined in peace: but I sit up late talking to the various youths as they come in from their dinners. On Thursday there was the state entrance of the Emperor into Moscow. Birkbeck had machinated for places and ultimately we went to the Kremlin, where I was placed in the front row of a box built just opposite the three churches which the Emperor visited. Of course we had to sit and wait for hours. It was a lovely day luckily. At first my interest was in my surroundings. They were queer enough. In my box was the Armenian patriarch, with his black silk embroidered robes and tall pointed head-dress covered by a veil, falling behind; then the Lutheran superintendent, a German from the Baltic provinces. On the left were two boxes, one for the Khan of Bokhara, the other for the Khan of Khiva, resplendent in Oriental brocades and most magnificent. On my right were Mussulmans from the Caucasus, and Lamas from the Thibetan provinces, clad in yellow silk. The chief one wore a headdress divided into compartments, and in each compartment was a picture of Budda. Behind us sat representatives of the Russian nobility in uniform. The next row of boxes was given up to nuns, all dressed in black; the next to representatives of institutions, school-girls and the like. In front of us was the great courtyard with the grand staircase leading up to the Palace, and round it are three churches: between them was erected a stage, covered with red and guarded with soldiers. Beyond them were a crowd, peasants and artisans, representatives of gilds. The great bell of Moscow, the largest in the world, boomed out over one’s head. Then suddenly it

burst out into a rapid clang, and all the bells in Moscow at the same time. There are more than 2,000 of them; you can imagine the din. This was the sign that the Emperor had entered the territory of Moscow. To add to the noise minute guns were fired.

‘Then we waited for an hour and a half: magnificently clad personages paced along the Emperor’s stage and made endless preparations: last of all came three sweepers, who carefully swept the passage. In the porches of each of the churches were groups of ecclesiastics and choirs: the clergy in cloth of gold, the choirs in a uniform of black and red. As the time came nearer incense was swung and everybody was on the alert. Then came five marshals with huge gilt staffs one after another, behind them the Emperor, between the two Empresses, with their mighty trains carried by pages. Then the grand dukes and members of the Imperial family: then grand duchesses, again with flowing trains: then the representatives of crowned heads with their suites. The Emperor was first aspersed, then he kissed the cross, then he kissed the hands of the three metropolitans and they kissed his. They entered the church: the bells suddenly ceased, and for a time we heard the sound of music from inside. The Emperor reappeared and visited the other two churches in like way, and then mounted the stairs to the palace. It was now 4.30. I had had no lunch, but a headache instead. I had some tea, and walked back and spent a dilapidated evening. Yesterday Nicolai¹ found me out and busied himself about my affairs in trying to get me a carriage. We had only heard of one, which cost 800 roubles, nearly 90*l.* for the fortnight! You may imagine my horror; but it is absolutely necessary, as I cannot go about in a *droschki* or cab, as they are miserable things, several degrees worse than the Roman *botte*. Nicolai tried to get one cheaper, but the first effort failed, and we had to close with the only offer before us, as I had to go and see the Emperor at one.

‘There in the palace everything was very magnificent; Pobiedonostzeff took charge of me and walked me through the rooms, then he introduced me to Briennios, the patriarch of Constantinople, the man who discovered the *Διδαχή*, whom I was pleased to see, and several Russian princes came and talked. Then, quite suddenly, I was seized and told to go through a door, where in a little room stood the Emperor and Empress. I really felt quite casual, and had a little conversa-

¹ A cousin of mine from Reval, Mr. Nicolai Koch, who had married my elder sister.

tion with them in English. I made great mistakes in my court manners, but I dare say they forgave me. The Emperor is a very attractive man, with blue eyes, and a great charm about his face, which lights up and is very kindly. We talked and laughed, I am sorry to say. The Emperor said that I would find the coronation fatiguing: I said, what must it be for him? In fact, we had an afternoon call conversation. I was treated with great distinction, as I was called in first. The Empress looked very nice dressed in white silk, and occasionally smiled. Then I went and lunched at a restaurant.

‘I ought to have told you that before going to Court, the Metropolitan of Kieff came to return my call. All the domestics rushed out of their several dens to kiss his hand on the staircase, and I went up mightily in their estimation. Later in the afternoon I went to call on the Metropolitan of Moscow, but he was ill. There we met Sabler, who is Pob’s¹ second in command. He at once carried us off to a convent of Strasnoy, where I had tea with the abbess. They make at the convent all the bread for the Communion, and I was fed with little loaves made for that purpose and delicious jam. But Sabler ordered the choir to come and sing in the next room: you know that they always sing unaccompanied and consequently have lovely music. I was delighted, but asked with amazement how the choir could be gathered at a moment’s notice. “Oh,” was the answer, “it is the nuns.” “But,” I said, “they sing bass.” “Yes, of course.” I got up to look: such a sight. Sombre, pallid, ugly women of all ages; but these were the basses and tenors. It is a speciality and takes a vast amount of training; but they do it. Their singing was perfectly marvellous: they can sing pianissimo without becoming flat. It is quite wonderful. They all bowed low before me when they had done.’

‘Whitsunday: May 24.

‘I am getting on, and did a good day’s work yesterday. I had to square the chaplain to have a special service for the Duke of Connaught, at 10.45 this morning. The chaplain said there would be no choir, no organist, and no congregation. I told him it must be done, as the Duke asked for it. He said it would destroy his 11 o’clock service, which had been announced. I took the matter in hand: said we must have a short service at 10.15, and another at 11.15, and I would preach at both. I mentioned

¹ Pobiedonostzeff.

it to some newspaper correspondents whom I saw at lunch. The church was crowded. I ordered Litany and Ante-Communion, and preached a short sermon, which was all done in the hour. Then we had Matins, and I went on with the celebration, and preached again to the ordinary congregation. I lunched with the chaplain, who has a lovely girl of the age of ten, with whom I made friends. Then I was ordered to see the Duke of Connaught, who was very friendly and pleased with my sermon. It was the Queen's birthday, you remember, and I took the line of the work of the Spirit in diversity of character and unity of purpose underlying difference. Then I spoke of the impressiveness of the Russian people praying for the gifts of the Spirit to the great head of the national family : and ended by saying that we could sympathise with them because we knew how much we owed to our Queen. The Duke said it made him cry, and indeed he wiped his eyes very hard, as I happened to see. But this has carried me on to to-day, and I have not told you about yesterday. I spent the afternoon in writing my name, and then called on Pobiedonostzeff, with whom I talked for nearly an hour. He is a most interesting man of powerful mind, clear vision, and large knowledge. He talked about Kidd's "Social Evolution," and Balfour's book ; he has read everything : admires "The Earthly Paradise," and wonders how Morris can be a Socialist. I find him one of the ablest men I have ever met. Then Birkbeck took me to tea with Princess Mistchertsky, who has a large family of daughters, and all speak English. They were all very nice, and gave me a copy of the Proclamation of the Coronation. It was proclaimed by heralds at various gates, who then threw a few magnificently printed copies among the crowd. These are very rare, and she insisted that I should have one, which she had got. I give you this as an instance of the kindness of these people. I am called upon now by stray clergy, and if I am in, I scarcely have a moment's peace. Last night I could scarcely find time to make a sermon, and I thought it was a very bad one, but apparently it did. I think I am getting on too well and want snubbing.'

' May 26.

' I left off on Sunday afternoon and have not had a moment since. I dined at the Embassy to celebrate the Queen's birthday. We were a party of 70, and dined at little tables of eleven each. I took in Madame de Claney, a good old German lady, but had not much chance of talking to her, as I sat next Princess Louis of Battenberg, who is

a sister of the Empress, and who talked to me all the time. She is amazingly clever and well informed ; those Hesse girls have been very well brought up, and are very pretty and attractive. She is staying with the Grand Duke Sergius, the Governor of Moscow, who is the Emperor's uncle, and married another Hesse princess, who is most beautiful. . . . Yesterday Nicolai came and took me to the picture gallery here, made by a rich merchant, and open to the public. It was very interesting, of course all modern Russian pictures : they are all realistic, and deal with popular life ; they are like everything else in Russia, sombre and *triste* ; deathbeds and invalids and prisoners abound. I had to get up at 5.30, for to-day's function.¹ We were in the cathedral soon after seven, and I had about the best place possible. It is quite needless for me to write a description of the spectacle, as you will have seen it in all the papers. It was far beyond anything I could have imagined, and the service was, from a religious point of view, wonderfully impressive. I will keep my description till I get back. When the service was over we went out, and saw the Emperor mount the steps to the palace. It was a gorgeous day : the crowd was enormous : and the roar as the Emperor mounted the staircase, with six pages staggering under the weight of his train, and his huge diamond crown gleaming in the sunlight, was beyond anything that can be imagined. The two Empresses followed. When they reached the top they turned and bowed to the people, and then passed into the palace. I followed, having been invited to the State dinner, which perhaps was not described. The distinguished guests had lunch in various rooms, but this was not for me. I was presently taken charge of by a kindly officer, who led me to a quiet place, and gave me a chair. Then he found a room where he supplied me with tea. There Pobiedonostzeff found me—really his care of me knows no bounds—and took me to the banqueting hall in the Granovita Palata. It is a large room with a vaulted roof, and a huge square pillar in the middle, which is a buffet gleaming with splendid cups. The Court stood in one corner by the door : the Emperor's throne was opposite. It was on a stage under a baldachino. He and the two Empresses entered and were served, while all stood. The food was brought in by the great officers and handed from one to another. When he called for wine, the Court retired, and we

¹ Mr. Birkbeck writes : ' I got to the Bishop's by 6.30 and found him ready robed. He looked so magnificent in his red and gold Coronation Cope from the Abbey, his mitre and crozier.'

might sit and begin our dinner.¹ It was then 3.30, and I was rather hungry. In the other corner of the room was an orchestra, and choir, who sang all the time. The tables were arranged in the remaining space; all the great officials of the Empire were there, and the table nearest the throne was reserved for ecclesiastics. I was in the middle of it, between an Armenian bishop and Father John of Cronstadt, the great holy man of Russia. Unfortunately he spoke nothing but Russian; but we chummed, as far as we could: he kissed me, and drank with me, and was most friendly. One course of the repast was the presentation to each guest of a gold medal in commemoration of the Coronation. We had a mighty repast, but it was soon over, and I came back. On my way out the crowd thronged to kiss my hand. They were the regular *moujiks*, and did not know who or what I was: but their religious exaltation was such that they wanted somebody to be venerated. Father John was in front of me, and was mobbed. I soon was mobbed too, but it was impossible not to be touched by the evident feeling of the people. Poor dears, they are just like children, but such nice good children. I got to my carriage at last, and had a sort of progress, giving my blessing as I went through the streets. My cope was excellent; it was not on the same lines as their vestments, which are all cloth of gold. It felt rather odd dining in a cope, but I had no choice. As they do not carry pastoral staffs, mine was unique, and I tried to look very dignified. I can only say the whole thing quite surpassed any expectations I could have formed. It is a thing never to be forgotten. I pine to be back, and will now make tracks for that purpose: I must try and get away before the crowd.'

' May 27.

' Last night after dinner I strengthened myself to go out and see the illuminations. The crowd was immense: locomotion was difficult, and I went alone, as no one else was sufficiently vigorous. I got down to the river and saw the Kremlin, all the buildings of which had been covered with glass lamps containing candles, so that all the architecture, domes, and cupolas, and all, stood out in blue, green, yellow or white light, while electric lights rotated all round and fireworks ascended. . . . '

' May 29.

' . . . I will go on with my story. On Wednesday night I went again to dine with the Emperor. Is not that a

The Bishop was the only person not a Russian subject present at this banquet.

mighty honour? We assembled in a great hall, and then went to the banqueting hall : the arrangement of places was strictly to show the connexion of Church and State. At the principal table sat the ecclesiastics on one side and the Imperial party on the other. I was between an Armenian bishop and Father John as before ; but opposite me was the Duke of Edinburgh, and we talked across the table. The dinner was magnificent of course, with a mighty orchestra to play all the time. It began at 7 and was over about 8.30. When the Emperor retired the guests soon dispersed. I came back and took Forestier to see the illuminations, which looked even more beautiful. On returning about 12 came Prince Andronikoff in a fuss, because I ought to have presented myself at an Imperial reception, where all the clergy went to congratulate the Emperor. He wanted to know what was now to be done. Punctiliousness knows no end ; so I wrote to somebody to say I would go yesterday. So in the morning I had to inform two English chaplains and Birkbeck that they were to go with me. At 12.30 I went to the palace in my Convocation robes and staff, duly attended. There was an enormous throng, but everybody was kind to me, and made me a place soon. There was great splendour in a mighty hall, and I advanced and congratulated and shook hands with the Emperor and kissed the hand of the Empress, and bowed and departed. The Empress looked nearly dead with fatigue, and had to go on till 5 o'clock. It was 2 before I got any lunch. Then there were some calls to pay, and I came home and fell asleep. Then we went off to visit a settlement of *raskolniks*, who are Russian dissenters, outside the walls, a quiet little place with two splendid churches, all gleaming with eikons. We had to drive back, and I hastily dressed and dined before going to a State ball at the palace. There were about 8,000 people there : all stood in rows about ten deep, and the Emperor and Empress and royal personages and ambassadors walked with their ladies between the rows while music crashed. This was supposed to be a polonaise. I got out presently on to the balcony and looked at the illuminations, which were more marvellous seen from above. . . . This morning I had scarcely finished breakfast before I had a visit from a professor, who is writing about Anglican Orders : then came the charming Bishop of Finland to pay a call before his departure.'

'May 30, 1896.

'Yesterday I was rung up by a telephone and received a message that there was a ticket for me at the theatre in the evening. That is the way that things are done. There is

so much to do that tickets are issued at the last moment, and you never know where to find them ; so most of your time is spent in waiting. I went to the Embassy to dinner. . . . We went off at 7.30 and waited for the Emperor's arrival. The theatre is a very large and fine building ; it held 2,800 people. I was in the front row of the stalls, and had a splendid view. All the stalls were filled by officers in magnificent uniforms and the boxes gleamed with ladies. Opposite the stage was the Imperial box ; when the Emperor arrived we all stood and shouted, and the band struck up the National Anthem, and the enthusiasm was mighty. Then began a Russian opera by Glynka, rather old-fashioned ; they only did a bit of one act, but it was full of old Russian airs. Then came a long pause, and after that a ballet, to which the Russians are devoted. It was a great spectacle, and the dancing was admirable : but it was of the old style of ballet, the Queen of Pearls, under the sea, and rather of the pantomimic kind. . . . So far I wrote, when I was again rung up from the Embassy with the news that there was a ticket for me to a stand at a great popular festival given to-day. I went to see our landlady, who told me that there had been a sad accident this morning. At the distribution of memorials of the Coronation to the crowd, the rush was so great that many were suffocated. It is difficult to learn details. . . . We set out for this great exercise ground outside the walls at 12.30, and drove through blinding dust. At 2 the Emperor arrived : the crowd must have been about half a million : the shouts were tremendous : and caps were thrown into the air, never, I should think, to be recovered by their owners. There was a vast orchestra and choir opposite the Emperor's box. I was just at the left. The National Anthem was sung time after time, while the people cheered ceaselessly. Guns were fired, bells were rung, and the noise and dust were terrific. This lasted for three-quarters of an hour, when the Emperor withdrew. Meanwhile there were great stages erected for ballets for the crowd : there were huge towers of merry-go-rounds, and various forms of entertainments spread all around.'

' Trinity Sunday, May 31.

' This morning I went off to church, and preached and celebrated. The Duke of Connaught was there again. Then I lunched with the chaplain, and have just returned. I received an order this morning to write an account of the Coronation for Her Majesty. So I must set to work on that with pains and care. I should like to please her.

‘The accident yesterday is a most awful thing. Fully 1,700 people were killed. There were to be 400,000 presents distributed, and in the crush at the beginning the first ranks were thrown down and trampled on. It is quite terrible to think of, and everyone is plunged in woe. It is useless to consider what the mistake was; but there is the sad fact that more people were slain in a holiday than would have perished in a battle . . . The action of a crowd is incalculable.’

‘June 3.

‘On Monday we went for an expedition to the Troitsa Monastery, the most holy place in Russia . . . I got up at 5.30 for the purpose. At the Troitsa we first joined the service in the church thronged with pilgrims, and saw several children communicated, which was odd. Then we visited the Prior, who gave us tea and lovely bread and jam. We explored the monastic treasury and all the buildings. Then we drove to some dependent cells situated in a fine forest, with little lakes beside them, very pretty and very interesting for a view of Eastern monasticism. We returned about 3, and had a large dinner with the chief officials; it was all of fish, and was most excellent. They were very kind, and we carried off presents of pictures which they make there. . . .’

The Bishop made the following note at the time of the remarks made by M. Pobiedonostzeff in the conversation alluded to in his letter of May 24 :

‘The unity of the nation depends on the Church. The one anti-national power is that of Rome, which subverted the ancient organisation of the Church to make it a political power. It had succeeded, but the Roman Church was materialised in consequence, and the foe of all national institutions. The supremacy of the Pope was the strongest power that existed in Europe: it was highly organised, possessed of great wealth. Its members always worked for its objects. He was not pleased that Germany and England were represented by Roman Catholic ambassadors. The Russian Church corresponded to the needs of the Russian people. Conversion had been wrought by monasteries, which were still centres of civilisation. The music of the Church spread everywhere, and created a taste which ameliorated life. The services of the Church were pure poetry, and impressed the great truths of religion on the popular mind. You may speak of superstition in the veneration of eikons: it was a prayer struggling for expression. It might not be possible to tell

how it appealed to the ignorant mind ; but superstition required exact definition ; nothing was entirely free from it. Certainly the superstitions of free-thinkers went deeper than anything that could be put down to the most ignorant Christian. The great enemy of the Russian Church was Rome. In Poland its political influence was steadily used for disaffection. In the neighbourhood of Austria priests objected to eikons and substituted their images. The Bible without the Church could be made to mean anything. He spoke of Davies' "Unorthodox London," and of the religious census in the United States. Such dissidence was impossible for a country like Russia.'

The Bishop was much impressed by M. Pobiedonostzeff, and considered him one of the most able and interesting men he had ever met ; he described him as clever, spare, and sharp—a man who could be disagreeable ; but he was convinced of the sincerity of his efforts to promote the good of his country. M. Pobiedonostzeff's opinion of the Bishop was expressed in a letter to Mr. Birkbeck in 1901 :

'It was through you that I had the fortunate opportunity of getting to know him in conversation, in which we frankly exchanged our views, and from which I carried away a most gratifying impression. I am not speaking of his intellect, his learning, or his literary talent. What was most to be prized in him was his heart, a heart sincere, and filled with love for men, and with the desire to help them just whenever the need presented itself. He was able to understand not only the worthy qualities, but at the same time the weaknesses, in a man ; while in religious questions he had a soul keenly sensitive to every belief and every conscience. For us it was delightful to see and to feel with what spiritual penetration he had investigated our Church, and had been able to comprehend in her a reflection of the soul of the Russian people. His attitude towards Church matters was that of a *savant*, and at the same time of a poet, responding with his soul to everything that was beautiful, and to everything that was right, wherever he might see it . . . here in Russia, those who knew the Bishop were able to appreciate him.'

On reaching London, the Bishop went straight to Lambeth to report to the Archbishop the result of his mission, and on June 9 he got back to Peterborough. This sight of Russia and of the Russian Church and people on such a momentous

occasion fired his historic imagination and produced a profound and lasting impression upon him. What he had observed and heard convinced him of the absurdity of Englishmen attempting to suggest schemes of reform for Russia or to solve her problems. Her conditions, her civilisation, the character of her people, he saw to be so different from ours that it was vain to apply our standards to her. Yet all that he had learnt made him clear that it was of supreme importance that England and Russia should learn to understand one another, and should be drawn more closely together, since much of the future of the world, especially of the Eastern world, lay in their hands. Moreover the strength of both lay in their sense of a national mission. There was room for both to fulfil that mission, and there was no need for them to hinder one another.

He often spoke strongly about the folly of the English in trying to manage the affairs of other nations by public meetings and otherwise, and said that Russia neither appreciated nor understood that kind of attention. His own attitude in Russia had been that of one who tried to understand rather than to criticise, and this he felt should be the attitude of the English towards the Russians. The sight of the way in which the religious life of the Russian people found its expression in the national life was specially grateful to one to whom the national side of the English Church meant so much. In many of his talks with distinguished Russians he had realised how, without any organic union, the English and the Russian Churches could at least exist in perfect harmony and with a thorough understanding of one another. His ideas about the whole meaning of the Coronation ceremony he expressed in an article for the 'Cornhill Magazine'¹ to which I would refer those who would like to see it with his eyes.

His conclusions about the political condition of the time may be judged from the following record of a conversation with the Hon. (now Sir) Schomberg MacDonnell (then Lord Salisbury's private secretary), who writes :

'He had an extraordinary insight and knowledge of foreign politics. I travelled with him for two hours soon

¹ Since republished in *Historical Essays and Reviews*.

after his return from the Coronation at Moscow, during which time he discussed the whole situation in Europe. He was very earnest as to the mischief caused by the antagonism of Russia towards England : in his view the great guarantee for peace would be a thorough understanding between the two Powers : this he hoped might be brought about by Lord Salisbury and Prince Lobanoff, though he admitted that the latter was at heart deeply prejudiced against England. I asked him how he thought Germany would view such an understanding : "There was no doubt," he replied, "that she would not like it. Rightly or wrongly, Prince Bismarck had always made the separation of Russia and England a cardinal point of his foreign policy ; and the same policy was evidently going to be followed in Germany for a long time to come." It was a mistaken policy, in his opinion, as he believed the best combination possible would be England, Russia and Germany : with a good understanding between these Powers it would be impossible for anybody to break the peace of Europe. France he regarded as a real danger, though unable to do much mischief so long as she was kept in check by Russia : still her upper classes were idle and effete : her middle class and her government corrupt ; and her army not to be trusted : better material for a conflagration could hardly be imagined : fortunately the absence of any strong claimant to the throne was a great safeguard : otherwise the present state of affairs could not last. Italy would never flourish until she hardened her heart and reduced her army : her only salvation lay in abandoning militarism for the development of the country ; but he doubted if any king would have the strength and courage to do it. As for Turkey and the Balkan peninsula, he would prophesy nothing, only he thought that Russia had fixed her eyes on the Far East more than on Constantinople : and he was quite certain that Russia was adopting a very different policy towards Mahomedans ; now that she ruled over so many of them in Asia, it was to her interest to appear as their protector rather than to allow them to be bullied : on the whole, he was inclined to think that Turkey in Europe would last longer than people anticipated. As for Russia moving a finger to aid the Armenians, the idea was preposterous : Russia did not want them any more than Turkey : they were not of her Church, they did not make particularly good soldiers : and they were too fond of anarchical and revolutionary sentiments to be welcome immigrants.

'Austria seemed to him to be in a very dangerous position : as long as the Emperor lived—well and good—he would

probably be able to hold the country together ; but after him—the deluge ; and the great danger to Europe seemed to him to lie in the struggle which must inevitably follow between Russia, Germany and Austria herself.’

The Bishop received the following autograph letter from the Queen in return for the letter he wrote to her at her request describing the Coronation :

‘ Balmoral Castle : June 11, 1896.

‘ The Queen wishes to express her warmest thanks to the Bishop of Peterborough for his most interesting and instructive letter. The description was so vivid and so beautifully written that it enables the Queen to understand and follow it all as no other description has done to the same extent.

‘ The Queen feels like a mother to the dear young Empress, who lost her mother at such an early age and then her father.

‘ She was very often in England from her earliest childhood, and the Queen has also a great affection for the young Emperor. How terrible that this awful catastrophe should have occurred to cast such a gloom over everything !

‘ The Queen hopes to see the Bishop on her return to England.’

Later he sent the Queen a copy of his ‘ Cornhill ’ article, asking at the same time whether the Empress would perhaps like a copy : to this the Queen replied :

‘ Balmoral Castle : September 8, 1896.

‘ The Queen is most grateful to the Bishop of Peterborough for his enlarged and beautiful account of the Coronation at Moscow, and feels sure that the Empress of Russia would be delighted to receive a copy.

‘ The Queen will give it to her dear grand-daughter if the Bishop will send it to the Queen.

‘ She trusts she may not seem very indiscreet if she asks him to let her have a few more copies for her children. It is impossible to describe anything more admirably and graphically than the Bishop has done, giving at the same time such an interesting description of what such an act signified.

‘ How the Queen wishes she could have seen it.’

He was summoned to Windsor in the following autumn to give the Queen a verbal account of what he had seen. She was so much interested in what he told her that he was

delayed at the Castle till some more of the Royal Family were able to listen to his story.

At the next Bishops' meeting, the Archbishop asked him to give an account of his experiences. The Bishop of Rochester says: 'I think he must have spoken over an hour, but I don't think we took much count of time: it was done with such ease and clearness and point.'

Everyone was keen to hear what he had to tell, and he was always ready to show his photographs of Russia and recount his experiences. He also lectured several times on the Coronation to most enthusiastic audiences, until the requests were so numerous that he was obliged to say that he would not do so any more. He kept up his own interest in Russia, and especially studied the novels of Dostoiewsky, who his Russian friends had told him was the most characteristic of their writers. He was always keen to read any book which could add to his knowledge of Russia.

Immediately after his return he gave the Romanes lecture at Oxford. He had had some difficulty about the choice of a subject, and had consulted Dr. Garnett.

' December 27, 1895.

' Dear Garnett,—The Romanes lecture was founded by the late George Romanes at Oxford in imitation of the Rede lecture at Cambridge. It has only existed for four years, and the lecturers have been Gladstone, Huxley, Weissmann and Holman Hunt. It may be on any subject except politics or religion. I enclose you a copy of my Rede lecture, when I was fortunate enough to hit upon a new subject of some interest. It was suggested to me by coming across a letter of Humphry Duke of Gloucester, which I published in the "Historical Review" last year. Working at the subject suggested to me in turn the collecting of these remains into a volume for the Roxburgh Club. The materials would fall into two groups. (1) Italians connected with England. (2) Englishmen who learned in Italy. The collection would cease with the coming of Erasmus, when the English Renaissance flowed into the general stream.¹

' The only subjects which I have in my head for a Romanes lecture are ecclesiastical, and so will not do. I do not know if "Oxford under Elizabeth" would not wander into ecclesiastical affairs. "Oxford Men of Letters in the Sixteenth

¹ This plan was never carried out,

Century" are few and undistinguished. I wish Gabriel Harvey or Sir John Harrington had been Oxford men.'

'April 6, 1896.

'... After many struggles I fixed on a frivolous subject for my Romanes lecture, "English National Character." It came into my head *à propos* of current events: but I mean to plead that history ought to be written and studied more with a view to the explanation of existing national character, which is the permanent result of the past. Perhaps that might occupy an hour without boring people too much.'

The lecture was delivered June 17.¹ He said that the subject had been suggested to him by 'the sudden interest in our doings which other countries had unanimously displayed.' He traced the causes of the growth of that aloofness of England from the general system of Europe, that desire to go its own way which, in his opinion, did much to account for the way in which England has been and is misunderstood by other nations. The lecture is very characteristic of him both in substance and in form. His love for his country led him at all times to ponder much on English characteristics, to compare English men and English customs with those of other countries, by no means always to England's advantage. Many things in this lecture record the result of his own observations as well as of his studies. There are frequent bits of practical advice, such as: 'We should not be so uniformly and aggressively reasonable in the advice which we tender them [other nations] so freely.' 'Perhaps it would be kind on our part if we drew a sharper line of distinction between the advice which we give to one another and that which we send abroad.' He exhorted Englishmen to try to adopt a more sympathetic attitude to people of other nations. 'History should teach us sympathy with the national past of other peoples.'

The death of Lord Lilford in 1896 was a great grief to him. To no one in his diocese had he felt more attracted, and he had the warmest admiration for his life and character. He writes of him:

'To me he was a man of remarkable attainments and singular charm, a man whom to know was a lifelong

¹ It is published in *Historical Lectures and Addresses*.

possession. . . . When first I met him we were entire strangers. . . . I found a man confined to a bath chair, a man with a massive head of great distinction, full of intelligence, bearing traces of that fastidiousness which goes with culture, but chiefly attractive by gentleness and a singular expression of kindness. A very little conversation showed me that I was in the presence of a man of remarkable intellectual power, and we were soon talking with a freedom and a range of subjects which to me was quite unexpected. I soon found that everything I knew, or in which I was interested, was within his ken. . . . We talked of European literature, politics and society. We compared notes of travel and experiences of various peoples.’¹

Intercourse with such a man was a delight and refreshment, and the Bishop was glad of any excuse which took him to Lilford. To our children no treat was more welcome than a visit to the great collection of living birds there. Lord Lilford delighted in children and they in him. The Bishop writes :

‘Few more charming pictures linger in my memory than one of Lord Lilford being wheeled in his chair through his gardens, surrounded by a crowd of children, eager to ask him questions about the birds, but restrained by the consciousness that they must not come too near and push against him, all hanging on his lips as, with quiet humour, he gave them information suited to their needs.’

To Clementina Lady Lilford

‘Peterborough : July 13, 1896.

‘I will venture to write to Miss Powys some suggestions about the Memoir. I shall be only too willing to put on record what I knew and thought for the benefit of others. It is indeed true that the young need now-a-days to have the secret of character put before them. They are too apt to think that they can enjoy the flower of life without its root.

‘I fear that life will seem to you dreary and empty for some time to come. Indeed in your case it has been suddenly emptied of its immediate contents. New interests can only slowly form ; and they will form round the consciousness that his character and person are an abiding possession, with a power to renew. At first the sense of bereavement and of loss is paramount . . . you have first to face the fact of an irreparable loss. But it is not a mere loss ; there is much that remains. The spirit survives and is more clearly seen and

¹ Introduction to the *Memoir of Lord Lilford*, by his Sister.

more vividly understood. As you served the man while he was here, and rejoiced in his companionship ; so it is possible to serve still the abiding principle of his life—and find comfort in spiritual communing with it, a part of the eternal life of the world.

‘ I know that this seems cold and intangible. We do not know where to turn or what to do or think ; but processes are going on, healing processes of grace, which slowly make themselves manifest.

‘ There is a beautiful sonnet of Petrarch, who sees Laura in heaven amongst the angels ; she walks amongst them, but from time to time turns her head and looks behind and seems to be waiting for him :

Wherefore I raise to heaven my heart and mind
Because I hear her bid me only haste.

There remains a spell of life before the reunion : it is not a desert, but has its beauties and its lessons. Can you think that you are separated from him for a time that you may learn to know him better ? that you may learn something more to tell him hereafter—something that he taught you to learn, but which you had not time to learn while he was with you, because you were too busied with him ?

‘ There is a great principle applicable to common human life in the words of our Lord, “ It is expedient for you that I go away, for if I go not away the Comforter will not come unto you.” There is a spiritual presence, superior in some things to actual presence—not different but the same, only appealing to other parts of one’s nature.

‘ Forgive these imperfect thoughts. It is not through the head that one gains comfort, but through the heart. Though prayers are dull and dry, they open the heart to God, and He speaks and guides and remakes.’

There were many country houses in the diocese where the Bishop stayed with pleasure, and soon became a friend of the family. His visits were almost invariably connected with diocesan engagements. Other visits he seldom had time to pay. For a holiday he preferred to get abroad, where he was not known, where he need not talk, and could be at peace. This desire for quiet and peace, his long silences during days spent in mountain walks, show the need he felt for times of thought and withdrawal into himself. But those who saw him with others, the life and centre of a big party in a country house, the storyteller at a dinner table, would

have imagined that it was his delight to shine in society. This was far from being the case ; peace and quiet, time to read a book, these were what he wanted ; he seldom went into society without a groan. Of course he must have enjoyed it when he was there, as everyone enjoys the sense of success, and intercourse with young people was a real refreshment to him. He found that the fact that he smoked helped him to know young men. Round the fire in the smoking-room, after the ladies and many of the elders had gone to bed, they could forget that he was a bishop, and he was able to talk and get them to talk without constraint or shyness.

In the summer of this year a great personal sorrow came to him. His brother was discovered to be seriously ill, and, after undergoing an operation, was sent home with the certainty of having only about two months to live. The Bishop was able to visit him twice during his illness, and was with him during the last week of his life. James Creighton was a successful timber merchant in Carlisle, but during the last year of his life he had chiefly devoted himself to public affairs. He had been a leading member of the Corporation for twenty-two years, had twice been Mayor of Carlisle, and had also been a member of the County Council. He was considered by his fellow-citizens to have been the pioneer of every movement for the development and improvement of the city in his day. On his deathbed he asked his brother to tell his fellow-citizens from him that he wished to express to them as his last message 'his profound conviction that the greatness of England was due to its capacity for local self-government, and that its future progress depended on the extension of this capacity ; he trusted that Carlisle would never be without a due supply of men who regarded it as at once their duty and their pleasure to devote their zeal and energy to the promotion of the common welfare.'

James Creighton's wife had died three years before, and his six children were left alone in the world, except for their aunt and uncle.

To Count Balzani

'The Snabs, Carlisle : September 12, 1896.

'Thank you very much for your letter. It is severe to watch for a week at the bedside of one whose mind remained

perfectly clear to the very last, who looked steadfastly to the end without flinching, and thought of everybody and everything in the future with perfect calmness.

‘There was something quite startling in the detached way in which he made wise provision for everything that might happen to his children. For the last three years he had to try and replace their mother to them ; it was hard to feel that he too was passing away ; but he did so with splendid courage.

‘We are trying to comfort the orphans, who are all very good and affectionate, but there are six of them, and the youngest is only nine. We go back to Peterborough next week. Luckily I was able to have this fortnight free.’

These days had been kept free, in order that he might go to his old parish of Embleton to open a new school. His successor in Embleton had just died, and been succeeded by Mr. Bolland, the headmaster of the Worcester Cathedral School. Now the visit to Embleton had to be given up.

To the Rev. E. Bolland ‘The Snabs, Carlisle : September 6, 1896.

‘I am very sorry not to be with you at the opening of the school. It would have been a very great pleasure to me to have had the opportunity of meeting old friends, who are very dear to me, and of rejoicing with them at a great advance in the welfare of Embleton. I had always felt that the old school was inconveniently situated, and was not so comfortable for the children as we should have wished. I made one or two efforts to secure a better site, and arrange for a new building. My attempts failed, and I could only commend the matter to my successor. His perseverance has been successful, and you must rejoice to enter upon the fruit of his labours. The new school will be a lasting memorial of his zeal and energy.

‘I know that you will not fail in interest in all that concerns the training of the young. Nothing that can be done, no sacrifice that is required, is too much for that all important work. In each generation we must see much that we can never achieve, and our hope must be in the generations that are to succeed us. We can only labour to build up their character, to convince them of our interest in their welfare, and to send them out to face life’s difficulties with the fear of God in their hearts. No pang was so great to me in leaving Embleton as my leave-taking

of the children in the school. Some may perhaps still remember bidding me good-bye.

‘I often think of things which I left undone at Embleton; may God give you His grace to do them better than I could have done them. . . . Say to all who are there on Tuesday that I hope God may bless them, and prosper this new school to His glory and the good of all who are trained therein.’

To the same

‘The Snabs, Carlisle: September 10, 1896.

‘Thank you, and please thank everyone else, for your kind sympathy. . . . I am glad that your opening went off well. . . . Such a gathering, as you say, does much good in bringing people together. The worst of country life is the prevalence of family and other quarrels, which harden into standing feuds as in old days. The people at Embleton were fond of music and dancing, and I tried to develop social life as much as possible.

‘I think you will find that the best thing to do is to live amongst the people, learn to understand them, and then gently influence them individually. I gather that things have improved steadily since I left; and I hope that some of the seed I tried to sow has taken root. The northern people are not readily receptive, but what they do receive grows. They are quiet, sincere, and say *less*, not *more* than they think. It is a great thing that they have received you warmly. You must win their confidence; when once given it will not be withdrawn.’

After staying as long as possible at Carlisle, we went to Keswick that he might have a little change before going back to work. Two days spent in rambling over the mountains round Derwentwater revived his love for the Lake country. He wrote to his niece, ‘We have just been devising a plan that next August you and we, all of us, should take lodgings somewhere in the Lake country for three weeks. We can occupy several farmhouses and make ourselves merry and ramble at will.’

He took these orphan nieces and nephews to his heart as if they were his own children. ‘I wish we could all live together somewhere,’ he wrote to his niece, ‘but we have to live where we are put and make the best of it. And you know you are always in my thoughts, and we can help one another as much by thinking and praying as we can by actual talking.’ They continued to live together in the house

that their father had built near Carlisle ; but they often visited us, and the Bishop was in constant communication with them. However busy he was, he found time for his regular letters to his nephews at school and his nieces at home. He said that he must give them the best part of his own attention, as our children had a mother to take care of them. We always considered them as our own children.

The Diocesan Conference was held at Northampton at the end of September. The Bishop devoted much of his opening address to a consideration of the marriage laws, particularly with regard to the question of marriage with a deceased wife's sister. He showed how the opposition to such marriages rested on principles, and that the question could not be decided simply by reasons of convenience. The truth which the Church was specially bound to assert was 'that progress is only possible if men are taught to submit their individual wishes to the common good, and to find a fuller satisfaction in curbing their desires for immediate gratification of their impulses.'¹

He touched in the course of his address on the question of the massacres in Armenia. Mr. Thursfield wrote to him about what he said on this subject, and the Bishop answered his criticisms in the following letter :

To Mr. J. R. Thursfield

'Peterborough : October 3, 1896.

'My dear Dick,—I am in entire agreement with you in your main contention. But I could not, at a diocesan conference, give a lecture on foreign politics : my language led, as far as it went, to your conclusion. I said that we should learn one thing, "the evil results which spring from international jealousies in the past," by which I meant our unworthy treatment of Russia. I went on to say that it was consequently hard for us "to prove the uprightness of our intentions," and I suggested that we should do our utmost to make it clear that we were actuated by motives of humanity. I am afraid that in your quotation of my utterance you have omitted the first part of the sentence : "We must strengthen the hands of our rulers by an assurance *that we are all united in our desires*," and that we trust in their wisdom "to translate that meaning into practical form."

¹ *The Church and the Nation*, p. 148.

‘Of course such brief allusions are of no real value. But I had in my mind exactly what you say. I am not prepared to shriek about Armenia, because I do not think that those who shriek are prepared to pay. There is no practical step possible except to hand the whole thing over to Russia. Is the public who shrieks prepared for this? I do not think so: the old dread of Russia and India remains, and Russia in Constantinople would be a shock. Well, how are we to pave the way? I am ready to do anything that can be wisely done. . . . Since my return I have had a talk with —, in which I very frankly stated my own opinions in favour of a pro-Russian or rather cum-Russian attitude on our part. I am doing all I can to promote it. But I must do it gently and cautiously. There are many who are as much prepared to denounce Russia as the Turk. Our friend — would as soon preside at an anti-Russian meeting as an anti-Turkish. The defect of our policy as expressed by public meetings is that it is hopelessly Pecksniffian. We do not recognise differences of civilisation, modes of thought, above all conceptions of freedom. If English public meetings will say, “We recognise Russia as a great civilising power, with great advantages for the work of pacifying Eastern Europe. We will take all our jealousies and suspicions out of the way, and will do our best to work hand in hand for the good of the East”—well. But will they?’

‘I cannot take so strong a view as you do of the situation: it is serious, and horrible. But there have been many horrors in the course of the world’s history, and we will never get rid of them till we get rid of human sin. “The wheels of God grind slowly.” These things have torn up our national policy in the past. It takes an effort to make a new one. But the trend of men’s minds is to be slowly led in the right direction. Englishmen above all other people refuse to think things out: I am not sure that the disciplinary effect of discovering that indignation meetings in England produce nothing, is not a necessary step in the political education of the British public. Let us hasten to saddle it with responsibility. That was the upshot of my remarks: in my own sphere I explain in private what I say in public, and my utterances serve as texts for comments.

‘I am always projecting a visit to you, but I am always horribly busy and business grows every year.’

At the end of September the Congregational Union met in Leicester. When in Dr. Magee’s days the Church

Congress was held there, the nonconformists were most kind in offering hospitality, and the Bishop now asked his clergy to remember this kindness and offer hospitality as far as possible to the Congregationalists. He himself addressed the following letter to the chairman of the Union :

‘September 30, 1896.

‘My dear Sir,—As representing the Church of England, I venture to send a few words of greeting to the members of the Congregational Union on the occasion of their meeting at Leicester. Christian charity and Christian courtesy alike demand some mutual recognition among the servants of the Lord Jesus Christ. Though we differ, we may differ without bitterness, and we may be assured that greater knowledge of one another’s principles and greater appreciation of one another’s work will dispel prejudices and misconceptions, and so reduce our differences to limits within which they may be brought by reasonable discussion. We may see no way towards agreement ; but we may at least do something towards knitting together the bonds of peace. There is one wish which we can all share, and I send it to you in all heartiness. May God’s Holy Spirit guide us all alike to speak the truth in love, and in all we do and say to seek first God’s kingdom and His righteousness.’

His letter was most cordially received and accepted in the spirit in which it was written. In answering him the chairman of the Union said, ‘Your lordship commands our respectful admiration alike for your valuable contributions to Christian literature, your zealous discharge of the duties of your high office, and the liberal spirit you have shown in your relations to other Churches. Nor are we insensible to the great work your Church is doing. We rejoice to feel that antagonism of principles need not be accompanied by a spirit of narrow exclusiveness.’

In October he read a paper at the Shrewsbury Church Congress on ‘The Idea of a National Church,’ probably the most successful of his Congress papers. It was listened to with rapt attention, frequently interrupted by signs of approval and at the end was followed by such prolonged applause, that he had to rise several times to acknowledge it. He said afterwards that he did not know what they wished him to do, they would not leave off clapping, and he felt like

a prima donna who had received an encore, yet he could not be expected to read his paper again.

In this paper ¹ he defined what is meant by a National Church. He said that it was a result of the conditions of human life that the Church must admit differences of organisation, that because man in the past could recognise no unity that was not structural, they had, since human frailty was unable to realise the spiritual order, save in the forms of earthly polity, sacrificed unity, which is possible, to uniformity, which is impossible. He spoke of the causes which had made impossible the maintenance of a uniform organisation of the Church, and through which the idea of a National Church came into existence. To the National Churches he said belonged 'the right to determine the best methods of setting forth to the people the contents of the Christian faith.' 'The idea of a Church universal in its organisation has failed, because it would not make room for two forces which have been most powerful in shaping the modern world—the forces of nationality and liberty.' He concluded by speaking of the work of a National Church. 'It persuades rather than commands; its weapon is influence, not power... the Church of England has the satisfaction of knowing that it is training the generations on whom the future of the world depends, and it is content to gender sons and daughters into freedom... it works in hope of repairing breaches, and restoring ancient ways.'

This paper was the expression of much that he had thought about during the last year. His visit to Russia had called forcible attention to the meaning of the national side of the Russian Church; the uniformity in fundamental belief, the difference in outward expression, of the Russian and English Churches had increased his former conviction that, in our imperfect condition, the outward forms of the Church must be adapted to the characteristics of the different nations. Moreover, beside his Russian experiences, he had been following with sympathetic interest the efforts made during the last year or so by Lord Halifax and others to bring about a better understanding between the Church of England and the Church of Rome.

¹ Published in *The Church and the Nation*.

In March 1894, Lord Halifax sent the Bishop a French theological Review, containing an article by the Abbé Portal, writing under the name of Dalbus, on Anglican Orders, saying how much he wished that 'something sympathetic in regard to such a treatise, and in reference to the desire for unity which it shows, could be put out by someone in authority.' To this the Bishop answered :

‘Peterborough : Easter Eve, 1894.

‘Thank you very much for sending me P. Dalbus. He is in outlying points very fair, and practically admits all that we want. But it is very difficult to take him seriously at the end. On his last page he corrects the Bishop of Oxford for saying that in the eyes of R. C.’s, all we need is papal approbation. Yet this is the one point he makes against us. The *materia* of Orders is the *porrectio patenæ cum pane*, because Pope Eugenius IV. said so ; and even if he was quite wrong in so saying, nothing but a general council could change it. We changed it without a general council, and so our Orders are invalid.

‘Any Roman controversy always comes back to the same point : but since the development of Neo-Ultramontanism, controversialists have seemed fairer and more sympathetic, because they could give up the old stories, and be fair-minded with safety. They had an arm in reserve. When pressed, they could always say : “You are probably quite right : but you acted without the sanction of a general council : therefore your action can never be right.” Now a general council means to them a council summoned by the Pope, and passing decrees which the Pope sanctioned. As the Church of England owed its rise to the necessity for abolishing the papal jurisdiction, it manifestly could not claim the papal consent to that step. Therefore all its proceedings have been invalid. Moreover they cannot be made valid without the Pope’s sanction ; and the Pope cannot give that sanction without destroying his own historical claims. It is for this reason that I think the Roman controversy is really barren so far as the Romans are concerned. You may go on well enough for a certain distance, and then comes the blank wall of the papal monarchy. What Episcopacy is to us as regards nonconformists, the Papacy is to the Romans as against us.

‘These remarks are not fitting to this season ; but I send them when I can, not when I would. My best Easter greetings to you.’

In the following summer (1894) the Abbé Portal came to

England, and Lord Halifax brought him to spend a night at Peterborough. After this visit the Bishop wrote :

To Lord Halifax

‘Peterborough : August 20, 1894.

‘Your visit was a great pleasure to me. The Abbé Portal was quite charming, and I sincerely hope that his visit to England may be productive of fruit. Good understanding can only come from knowledge and sympathy. *In foro juris* the arguments may go on for ever. The great step to agreement is the discovery that “except in opinion we do not greatly differ.” Then opinion is reduced to its due proportion.’

These letters show that the Bishop was not very hopeful about the result of the movement to obtain recognition from the Pope of the validity of English Orders. Lord Halifax was in Rome in the spring of 1895 and wrote to him about the interviews he had had with some leading ecclesiastics .

To Viscount Halifax

‘Sorrento : Ash Wednesday, 1895

‘My dear Lord Halifax,—Your letter and its enclosures are most interesting to me and give much food for meditation. The practical question in all such matters is, Who is to begin ? That is the great difficulty in all great reforms ; the first step must be made by whom ?

‘Now on the immediate question, the validity of Anglican Orders, I can see the Archbishop’s reasons for hesitating. The attitude of Cardinal Vaughan has been very aggressive and exasperating. It is impossible to admit that the Church of England is on trial, or asks for any recognition. There is no doubt amongst us of the validity of our Orders ; we are quite satisfied. Roman theologians have denied it, and have thereby made the breach. If they thought fit to take any steps to heal it, the effect would doubtless be great. The restoration of the unity of Christendom will be—not by affirming any one of the existing systems as universal, but by a federation. What we have to do is to sweep away foolish and one-sided controversy, and seek the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace. Natural differences, the sense of individual liberty, habits and modes of thought are too strong to be set aside. But there is no real reason why these should not be accommodated in one system, which admits of gradations. In the Mediæval Church, for instance, the Franciscans were at first something like the Salvation Army—*only they denied nothing*, and did not profess that their way was the only way. The Mediæval Church was very liberal to those who were

only positive, and not negative. Men might be as simple as they chose in their beliefs and in their practice, but it was not for them to object to what the Church had once allowed. Now some such conception as this must be at the bottom of reunion. We do not differ—any Christians—about the contents of the Christian faith, but about the proportion of them, and the means of their application to the individual soul. The real point of difference is about the means. Well, if someone says to me “I have found such and such means good for me” —even though they seem to me complicated, and in some ways unreasonable, why should I object? If another says “I do not find your means useful to me, and I want something more direct and more personal and simpler,” I must on the same grounds put up with him. If these various methods were put side by side, were allowed to work as parts of one system, the best would slowly make their power felt and approve themselves. But at present nonconformists do not discover their poverty: the Romans do not discover their want of contact with actual life. That is their real defect. They are upholding a system, not making it operative on life. Greater knowledge of our Church would help them greatly in this: and we need to know something of the greater versatility and adaptability of their methods.

‘This is becoming a discourse; let me sum up by saying that if any recognition of our position were given by the Pope, it would be of enormous use: but we cannot ask for it without putting ourselves in the wrong. We have done nothing to invalidate our Orders: Rome has wantonly denied them in the past. We at our worst have never unchurched Rome: latterly we have been almost too kind to her.’

The Bishop hoped at least that a better understanding might arise from these negotiations. When in April 1895 the Pope issued his letter to the English people, and many were irritated at what they considered its patronising tone, he preferred to regard it as a mark of friendliness. He said at his Diocesan Conference:

‘The fact that Pope Leo XIII. should have issued a letter to the English people is at least a manifestation of good will. I do not like to criticise that letter in detail. It was addressed to the English people, probably as an indication that no answer was expected. From me at least it shall receive none. I think we may accept a token of friendliness and of Christian sympathy in the spirit which it expresses. We must expect

that everyone who speaks of Christian unity should speak from his own point of view. That is inevitable. Everyone contemplates unity on the supposition that everyone else will ultimately agree with himself. How could he do otherwise? The first step must necessarily be to make us all more deeply conscious of the intellectual, the historical, and the sentimental differences which keep us asunder. But intercourse, friendly feeling, and reflection will enable us or our children to remove misunderstanding, to dissolve the veil of sentiment, to go behind the prejudices created by mistakes and misdoings in the past, to separate what is accidental and temporary from what is essential, to discover the real importance of the points which keep us asunder, to raise controversy above passion, to discuss principles without being troubled by the thoughts of temporary loss or gain. . . . Controversy is unfruitful when it is blinded by prejudice; it is only useful when it is directed towards the discovery of truth. It is premature to discuss at present methods of reunion, they must be left in the hands of God.'

Holding such opinions, he could not fail to regret deeply the publication on September 13, 1896, of the Bull of Leo XIII., which denied the validity of English Orders. This, which might well be regarded as a gratuitous insult to the English Church, could certainly not tend to remove misunderstanding. The Bishop expressed his opinion of the Pope's action in a letter to Mr. Birkbeck :

'Peterborough : September 14, 1896.

' . . . The Pope of Rome has been at his old games ; and doubtless Vaughan and Co. are chuckling. I think their victory will not profit them even in this world. It will entail on them a very long Purgatory in the next. I wonder if they have provided themselves adequately with Indulgences. But for the present and for the long future, this will end the leanings of the foolish towards the Western Church and will bring the Eastern Church into greater prominence.'

He at once agreed when it was suggested to him that an authoritative answer should be made to the Pope's letter ; and wrote on the subject to the Archbishop (Dr. Benson), who answered :

'September 23, 1896.

'My present opinion is that it would be desirable that a sufficient and strong document should appear from our

Episcopate (addressed *ad Anglos*). And none could so fitly prepare one as yourself, Oxford and Sarum. We should have to lay it before the bishops.'

The Bishop of Salisbury came at once to Peterborough, when the first draft of the answer was drawn up to be submitted to the archbishop, who was then in Ireland.

Before he could return it, there came the overwhelming shock of his sudden death.

To the Bishop of Salisbury 'Peterborough: October 12, 1896.

'My dear Brother,—The awful news this morning has filled us all with profound sorrow. It is useless to speak of the great blow which has so suddenly befallen us; we shall only slowly appreciate all that it means.

'But meanwhile we must do our duty, and feel increasingly the need of promptitude in carrying out what we have begun. I have been acting all through as the Archbishop's secretary for this matter: and I have a number of letters from him endorsing all that we are doing. It was his intention to send on the draft to the Archbishop of York: and then I suggested it should be put in type for revision. I spoke to the Archbishop of York at Shrewsbury about it, and he quite agreed. It is now desirable that the draft should go to him: I will write to the Archbishop's chaplain on this matter. But it is a terrible strain to think of anything at present.'

'Peterborough: October 27, 1896.

'Dear Brother,—I have been looking for (*i.e.* expecting) your draft. Perhaps you paused during the vacancy. But now—can we not get on, so that it may be one of the first acts of the new Primate?'

The Bishop's wish was carried out. The new Primate (Dr. Temple) carefully considered and amended the document which had been drawn up, and it was issued in February 1897 as an 'Answer of the Archbishops of England to the Apostolic Letter of Pope Leo XIII.' addressed 'to the whole body of Bishops of the Catholic Church.'

The following letters show what were the Bishop's views in helping to draw up this answer to the Pope:

To the Rev. W. Collins

'Exeter: October 11, 1896.

'... About the Roman Controversy: our position is to make clear that the national breach with the Papacy is still

on the same question—the papal jurisdiction—all comes to this. The Roman maintains that the papal supremacy is absolutely necessary, and that all are heretics who decline it. Talk about Orders and all the rest ultimately comes to some technical point, resting solely on the authority of a decretal. Press a Roman to the ultimate point, and it is the papal authority. The papal power is the one point to get at and expose.'

To Mr. W. J. Birkbeck

‘November 18, 1896.

‘I propose to make the Romans cross on the lines which I have taken up. Their ignorance must be exposed and the bubble of their pretentiousness continually pricked. But I do not want to read any of their retorts. A knowledge of what they say insensibly leads one to reply in the next thing one says oneself. This is a form of controversy, and I detest controversy. I want to speak the truth and leave fibs to the other side.’

The following is a letter to the Rev. W. Collins about a paper on the subject which he had submitted to the Bishop :

‘Peterborough : December 1, 1896.

‘I advise a readjustment from the point of view of a clear statement for those who are not great Latinists.

‘On slip 5 go on “Without dogmatising, or without assuming any claim to infallibility, we venture to put forward some evidence to prove

“(1) that the body of the document was written, doubtless by eminent theologians, in the English tongue.

“(2) that it was translated into Latin by some persons who either had an imperfect knowledge of English, or of Latin, or probably of both.

“(3) That portions of the document were written in Latin, probably by the Pope himself, and were translated into English by persons who either were not skilled in the accuracies of the Latin tongue, or who had so completely made up their minds what the Pope ought to have said, that their zeal to make him say it outsped their attention to his actual words.”

‘Then rearrange your evidence under these heads. Under (1) say that you have already shown that there is no research, and that all the knowledge except a dark sentence about Gordon was open to anyone in England. Then gather the passages which show *from their sense* that the English

original was prior . . . print the Latin and English in parallel columns.

‘(2) Gather all the ludicrous mistranslations of the English.

‘(3) . . . Make the introduction stronger “When we turn to consider the composition of Leo XIII. himself, we find a pious conclusion written in flowing style, which contrasts with the creaking and lumbering form which was doubtless intentionally adopted for arguments about which the writers seem to have felt that ambiguity was safest, and that the less said the better. The translators fail entirely to reproduce its niceties. Their minds are not attuned to the Pope’s mode of thinking, and they drag it to a lower level, while they attempt to give it greater unction.” . . . Do not think I am troublesome, but the success of this depends on its method. It must interest people who care about criticism, and its points must be clear.

‘The Romans must be smitten just now. It is unfortunately necessary to pin them. We must dispel the glamour once for all and get free. We have the chance. They have hoped to make a *coup*: we must turn it into a disastrous failure.’

LETTERS 1895-1896

In answer to a letter asking him to be lenient to one whom he had had cause to rebuke severely:

‘Peterborough: February 2, 1895.

‘It was very nice of you to write to me as you did. It was quite natural of you to pity — and to think that I had been severe, but, my dear boy, one must be severe. Life is severe. God is severe. We all do wrong, but we must all be taught repentance. You know that the Foolish Virgins were only a little careless and lazy, but they were shut out. It is just that carelessness and laziness which lead to everything that is most wrong. No one means to do anything wrong, but they slip into it. The great cause of all wrong is just doing the easiest and least troublesome thing, and trusting that all will come right.

‘However I had a letter from — this morning which shows that he sees this. If he sees it, all may be put right, and he may learn wisdom for the future. I trust that it may be of some use to you to see how easily one gets into a sin without meaning it. But if people are idle and without self-control, their natural propensity is to do the wrong thing. This must be seen and cured. I have written to — to tell him to learn wisdom in the future.’

To the Rev. T. A. Lacey

‘Peterborough : May 19, 1895.

‘I have just come back from Rome, and received your letter with great pleasure. Your paper on the *Roman Claims* is excellent, and goes to the point—the *one point*. All Roman arguments resolve themselves into the assertion of the necessity of submission to *papal jurisdiction*. It is not primacy, or recognition, but it is absolute submission to papal jurisdiction which is the one necessity for Catholicity according to the modern Roman view. This view is not that of the present Pope, I believe; but an institution grasps at *power*, because so many officials depend on its existence. This was the *fons et origo mali* in the sixteenth century. The revolt was against an extortionate Curia, and the Pope upheld it because he could not escape. This is the real hindrance still. Arguments about outlying things have really little weight: they are merely outposts to defend the central position.

To the Rev. G. C. Bell (Headmaster of Marlborough College)

‘Peterborough : August 2, 1895.

‘My dear Bell,—I am glad that Cuthbert leaves Marlborough with a good record. He has much to learn, like the rest of us: public schools teach some things and neglect others. At the best they are a period of one-sided development, and are consequently fraught with danger. You know that I am no unqualified admirer of the system. In fact I think that the problem of the future is the entire change of all our views about education from top to bottom. But this is a slow process. At present we live in makeshifts. But I should like to say that I am quite satisfied with the result of Marlborough on Cuthbert. It has done for him all that I could have expected. At the same time I feel that that is largely due to your personal influence and care. With another master it might have been otherwise.’

To the Rev. Canon Watson, Rector of Sharnford

‘Peterborough : September 18, 1895.

‘The subject of the Vestry is at once so difficult and so important that I think it needs full discussion. My own wish is briefly this. (1) For the purposes of the existing vestry, the care of the church, and the appointment of churchwardens—the vestry must remain as at present constituted.

‘(2) But I wish to see that vestry become the constituent of an ecclesiastical parish council, chosen from members of the church, which should have certain recognised powers, among them the election of a representative at R. D.

conferences, which I should like similarly to see possessed of definite powers of some kind and become an ecclesiastical district council. I do not see that the care of the church and the administration of ecclesiastical charities can be taken out of the hands of all parishioners.'

To Mr. W. S. Lilly

'Peterborough : October 6, 1895.

'Thank you very much for your article, which is excellent. It lays hold of the most hopeful feature of the present day—that we really have advanced in the pursuit of truth, and that we are willing to waive prejudice,—or at least introduce it only when it seems necessary to recognise the inherent limitations of any particular practice.

'I suppose you would defend More¹ on this ground. As a theorist he was free, in practice he must act with a view to circumstances. I could acquit him if he had merely executed the law. My difficulty is that he defended it on grounds which he had already theoretically abandoned and condemned. I admire More, but he had that weakness which haunts men of letters when they become politicians. Their command of language leads them astray ; they confuse principles. Of course More can be defended on the ground that the "Utopia" was a skit, and only expressed tendencies which were hopeless of practical realisation. Indeed it might be urged that it was written to show the hopelessness of idealism.

'I am waiting for Acton's Inaugural in an authorised form. I was disappointed that a change of the day prevented me from hearing it. I am glad to think that I was concerned in persuading Acton to go to Cambridge.'

To Miss Constance Barrett

'Peterborough : October 22, 1895.

'It was very nice of you to write to me. I saw, on glancing at the proceedings on Saturday, that I should not have time to speak. Whenever you organise anything in an afternoon remember :

'(1) To begin at 3 punctually, because at 4.30 everyone's thoughts turn tea-wards.

'(2) To tell the chairman that he must not speak more than ten minutes.

'(3) To eschew windbags even though they be marquises.

'(4) Never to have more than three speakers besides the chairman.

¹ In reply to some criticisms of Mr. Lilly's on the Bishop's Hulsean lectures on *Persecution and Toleration*.

' I do not mind telling you what I meant to say—that teaching was best envisaged as an introduction between the youthful mind and divine knowledge. All that the teacher could do was to make the introduction as little awesome as possible. The intimacy between the two parties must be of their making. Yet how much lies in introductions. The old plan in which some one muttered "Mrs. Hum-hum, let me introduce Mr. Ha-ha," left two people embarrassed in the presence of one another with a sense that something was expected of them but with no clue to follow. The chances are that they hate one another at first sight. You can follow out the line of thought.

' It is never worth while speculating how or why two people get to know one another. It is enough to accept the fact as a thing given. You and I know one another, don't we? Then I always think it is best to say so and accept the fact. If I can be of any use to you, well. I am always ready. Use me if you will, if I can be of any use. Anyhow life gives us nothing better than kindly and sympathetic thoughts one of another. Looks and words of recognition make life easier for us all.'

To Lord Halifax

' Peterborough : November 2, 1895.

' I send you my paper¹ as a poor return for yours. The Archbishop is desirous to issue it for the Central Church Society, so it will be generally accessible.

' I do not think your utterance at Norwich was at all rash. But there is one point which I think you ought to keep before you. Englishmen will not be moved by the argument that Roman formulæ are capable of being explained away. Of course we know that Rome's method has been one of accommodation and that her practices vary immensely, and that her formulæ are held in various senses. In fact, Rome has always followed, and has not directed, popular religious opinion. This is just where the average Englishman takes alarm. He believes in *truth*; he wants not the widest but the truest statement: he believes in raising and educating the people, not in finding room for their fancies and sentiments. There is somewhere the essential difference between the Latin and the Teutonic mind to be got over. It was this which asserted itself in the sixteenth century. The Reformation was the effect, not the cause, of a breach which had slowly grown: and the Teuton has been justified by its results.'

¹ The paper read at the Norwich Church Congress.

In answer to a request to take part in the movement to grant degrees to women :

To Miss Alice Gardner

‘ December 10, 1895.

‘ No, I cannot take part in any movement towards an organic change in the university system. It has always seemed to me a very grave question—carrying much with it. If there was any hope that the University would institute a drastic reorganisation of its system, I should rejoice. I could conceive the possibility of keeping the universities as corporations of students on certain defined lines, and then conferring titles of competency on recognised terms to other persons, who were not candidates for membership. But I do not see my way to considering merely women as such. The desire to write B.A. after one’s name—and to assert that you want to do so in the hopes of deluding people in Australia—these are things in which I cannot profess to concur.

‘ You will forgive me.’

‘ Peterborough : December 16, 1895.

‘ I do not quite think that you understand my point of view. I have no objection whatever to women becoming full members of the university. But I want first of all to have a clear definition of what is necessary for such membership. I doubt if such a definition as would satisfy me would meet the requirements of those interested in women’s education. In fact “ a degree ” has slowly changed its meaning, or rather its meaning is confused. Originally it meant membership of a corporation with certain rights attached : now it means a certificate of having passed examinations which are supposed to imply some capacity for teaching.

‘ I want the university to face the whole question—to separate membership from certificates ; to consider what will constitute a M.A., and to leave the B.A. in two classes (1) a badge of certain proficiency, (2) a step to M.A. The conditions for (1) need not be the same as for (2). But the procedure might differ *ab initio*. I pronounce no opinion whether or no the question of sex should be included under (2). Personally I think not ; but it ought not to remit any part of what is thought desirable.’

To Professor H. Sidgwick

‘ The Palace, Peterborough : December 12, 1895.

‘ My dear Sidgwick,—I quite agree with you that things are not now as they were in 1887, and that the question of degrees to women is one which must be considered. But all

I can see my way to is an attitude of benevolent neutrality in the first instance. I would discourage any opposition to the request for a syndicate to consider that question, but I increasingly feel that the interference of non-residents in university affairs is undesirable, and I feel that in this case my judgment on the matter of principle goes in one direction, and my sense of expediency goes in another. I am willing to discuss what I cannot approve. That is all.

‘I am afraid that I should be considered a pedant ; but I have a sense of the *constitution* of a university. Several recent changes have confused the old constitutional lines. I wish to see some plan by which the degree, as constituting its recipient a member of the *universitas* or corporation, should be distinguished entirely from the degree as a badge of educational proficiency. If this could be done, I should be quite satisfied. Only it ought to be done on a general principle. My dread is of the university ceasing to be an organised body, and becoming a rabble, connected only by the payment of fees. If the university can only say what it *is* I [it?] can do as it likes.’

To Mr. W. Alison Phillips

In answer to a question about the way in which the inaccuracy of the assertion made by a Roman Catholic that the spiritual jurisdiction of an Anglican bishop is derived from the sovereign could best be demonstrated

‘The Palace, Peterborough : December 26, 1895.

‘My dear Mr. Phillips,—Controversy is generally concerned with the hopeless task of contradicting old misrepresentations, which are never abandoned.

‘Let me put the facts as briefly as possible about the point you enquire about.

‘A bishopric is a barony, and has always been so. It descends not by inheritance, but by election. Hence on each vacancy it is under the guardianship of the crown, and has to be conferred afresh on the new holder. This has always been so : and in the good old times, which your friends would like to restore, bishoprics were frequently kept vacant for three, four, or five years, during which the crown enjoyed their revenues. Now they are filled up as soon as possible. The bishop after consecration enters upon his spiritual functions in their entirety ; but he is not possessed of his barony till he has done homage. The ceremony is the old feudal ceremony : he kneels before the Queen, places his hands between hers, and recites an oath of temporal allegiance ; then he kisses hands. A similar process occurs

in the case of every clergyman admitted to a benefice. He is first instituted to the spiritual function by the bishop ; he then takes a certificate to that effect to the archdeacon, who inducts him to the temporalities.

‘It is curious to note that the only other survival of the old form of homage is in conferring the M.A. degree at Cambridge. There the recipient kneels and places his hands in the hands of the vice-chancellor.

‘I hope I have made the point clear. Consecration in itself confers on a bishop all the spiritual powers of his office : he can after that ordain, and consecrate, and perform all episcopal acts. But he has not the temporal rights of his barony till he has done homage. The only practical inconvenience which occurs through delaying homage, as is sometimes inevitable, is that, if benefices fall vacant, of which the bishop is patron, he cannot exercise the right of patronage, as that is the right which goes with his barony.’

To the Rev. G. C. Bell (Headmaster of Marlborough College)

‘Peterborough : January 1, 1895 [96].

‘My dear Bell,— . . . I noticed that in his report ——— impressed his masters as childish. This arises because he went straight from home. I expect in such circumstances that the first term will be spent in finding his feet among other boys, and the ways of school life will be new. But, then, this is part of my view of what is desirable. I decidedly wish that boys should remain boys as long as possible. Hence I dislike preparatory schools and all their works. The quality which I most wish to cherish is the capacity for growing, both intellectually and morally. It is this quality which our present system increasingly destroys. The object of the master of a preparatory school is that the boy should get a scholarship at a public school. The object of a public school is that he should get a scholarship at the university. The object of the college tutor is that he should get a first class. These may, or may not, be good things ; they are if they come of themselves, but they are not worth the seeking. I foresee an entire revolution in our educational system coming from the discovery that success in it does not mean success in life ; *i.e.* that it does not take into account the real qualities of human character.

‘Think of the change that has come about in that way. In the old rough-and-tumble days, men got first classes by their ability and force of character. Gladstone and his contemporaries did. Balfour and his contemporaries do not.

Again, take bishops. I am the only one amongst the younger lot who gained academical distinction. I am quite appalled to think that in selecting men for promotion in my diocese, their university degree is never an element which comes into consideration. The cleverest and most intelligent man amongst my younger clergy is a passman from Durham University. Now these things seem to me significant of a crash. The British public is slow, but it finds out when an article does not pay. The higher education is ceasing to pay. The upper class has found this out. Young men of position are not now sent to the university, but go on a tour round the world, as being more educational for actual life.

‘Forgive this long harangue, but I wished to explain to you why I am no believer in our present system. I am content to use it, but I do not submit to it. The most dangerous part is the preparatory school, for it is applied earliest, and succeeds in turning out boys as per sample, in the right form for the educational mill. Now I do not want to have my sons ground into the regulation shape; I want them to be left capable of learning even at the age of 25. You will forgive my obstinacy.

You will be glad to know that I am quite satisfied with Cuthbert’s first term at college. His mind has expanded normally; his interests have developed: he reads in the vacation with steadiness, and talks intelligently without ceasing to be a boy, or losing the inestimable capacity of playing the fool. His tutor speaks well of him. He develops qualities of practical usefulness. He can influence others.

‘I am a student of the Renaissance. Then they understood education to be the development of the whole man. I am still old-fashioned . . . I have not thanked you for the trouble you have taken, but I do so very heartily.’

To the Bishop of Norwich

‘Church House, Westminster : February 14, 1896.

‘My dear Bishop,—I have been thinking over the question you asked yesterday.

‘It seems to me that in *deposing* a clerk, I should act on the same principles as if I were hanging him. We hang a man for a definite act, which he is proved to have committed. He may have been a very respectable man previously, and if his life were spared he might spend it very profitably. But he is hanged to show the detestation felt to his act.

‘I should degrade a man for a like reason : not because he

is [a] useless or unworthy priest, but because his act is such that it is impossible he should remain a priest.

‘Hence I should degrade for a definite action not a constructive charge.’

To the Rev. G. C. Bell

‘Peterborough : April 8, 1896.

‘My dear Bell,—I never wrote about religious education in secondary schools. There have been utterances at Church congresses more than once: but it is a difficult subject. I am not going to the Cambridge conference. The whole matter falls into another shape since the new Bill. . . .

‘From my experiences at the university I should say that schoolmastering as a profession suffered from *want of vocation*. Very few men are meant to be schoolmasters, they found themselves driven to it for the most part. This is bad. There is nothing which parents ought to insist on more than that boys should consider in time what they ought to do. I once examined all the men I could find at Cambridge on that point. The number who had any definite plan of a future was infinitesimal. The ordinary answer was “Oh, I suppose my father will find something when I leave the university.” I was so horrified that I preached a sermon on the subject.’

To Mr. Charles Roundell

‘Peterborough : July 21, 1896.

‘My dear Roundell,—I am much obliged to you for your letter; it was very good of you to write it. With all your diagnosis of present symptoms I entirely agree. I gather that, though your remarks are confined to the Church, you see the same process in every branch of human effort, not only in England but universally. We are in a period of uncertainty such as history has never witnessed. Science has said its say and has led nowhere; rationalism has led nowhere; materialism has no hopes. In politics machinery has broken down; liberalism is bankrupt. In international affairs no country has a clear ideal of its line of progress. Statesmanship has almost ceased to exist: everyone is conscious of forces which he cannot control, of impulses and instincts generated in the past, not to be regulated by any reasoning which can be framed at present. How things are going to settle down no one can say.

‘I think these symptoms arise from the force of the disintegrating powers, which promised what they could not perform, and pointed to possibilities which they could not realise. They had this great influence for good, that they awakened conscience, and this result still remains. It

produces the curious condition that men are living on a moral sense, transmitted and inherited, while they are restive under the discipline and claims of the systems which generated that moral sense. They are living on the fruits of a tree of which they are anxious to cut away the roots. This is especially visible in the decay of Nonconformity. Originally it was a system of rigid discipline founded on the theology of Calvin. The theology decayed, and Nonconformity tried to keep its spirit by identifying itself with Liberalism. It was frankly ready to say and do what the most enlightened people wished to have said and done. The result has been disaster.

‘Now what can the Church do in this crisis? It must keep alive Christian principles as the basis of national life. For my own part I believe that the attack on Christianity is intellectually repulsed. Most people feel that, and they want to work back to Christian principles by minimising them. This is called “undenominational Christianity” *i.e.* as much fruit and as little root as possible. A popular audience will always cheer a reference to “true religion stripped of the bonds of theology,” *i.e.* the results of the Christian conscience without the faith which formed it. Of course we now have reached the actual question of the present day. This underlies the education question, this animates Deceased Wife’s Sister and all the rest. It is the great question of the future.

‘This is the point of view from which I regard the question which you raise about sacerdotal pretensions. The term is used vaguely.¹ It means, in some people’s mouths, the maintenance of the historic organisation of the Church of England. This I think must be upheld in the interests of the nation. The machinery of the State may change, because it exists to do the people’s will. But the Church exists to uphold what it considers to be the truth; and though the application of that truth may vary according to the times, the truth itself remains, better understood, it may be, but itself unchanged. If “sacerdotal pretensions” mean tendencies on the part of the clergy to revert to modes of teaching which have been wisely abandoned, then I think they must be checked by all means. I admit that there are such tendencies: I deplore all demonstrations of clerical arrogance as being the temptations to which undisciplined zeal is exposed, and which constitute a real danger. My idea of the Church is an organised society holding a truth which it strives by every

¹ Mr. Roundell had said in his letter ‘There is a strong feeling that the dominant party in the Church is a sacerdotal party, and that there is nothing for it but to offer the most determined opposition to all such pretensions.’

means to set forth in the form which is most intelligible. The conception of sacerdotalism comes in when there is a suggestion that the interests of the Church are different from the society which it serves.

‘But I have no fear of any permanent harm from eccentric restlessness. The English conception of liberty is too strong to be set aside. Foolish experiments will be reduced to due proportions by the working of common sense.

‘There is, however, this great danger in modern politics—the enormous power gained by small resolute bodies. Extreme people are always shouting and protesting: moderate men are content to work quietly. Bishops see most of this latter class, in clergy and laity alike. The Church is always being judged by the former.

‘I need hardly say in conclusion that my own endeavour is to understand the views of laymen. I try to see and talk freely with every class, and I try my utmost to abate clerical pretentiousness in every form.’

‘Peterborough: August 13, 1896.

‘My dear Roundell,—Thank you for your very interesting letter. I jot down merely a few thoughts which it suggests.

‘(1) There is a *barbaric* element in society. It would seem that every organism carries with it some traces of its process of development, as a warning that it may recede if it does not advance.

‘(2) The organisation of the world into nations is in one way fruitful of hope. The spiritual force which moves may pass from one to another. Nations are strong as they produce character. So far as I can judge, England and Russia are foremost in this power. I take little account of America; it is yet an experiment.

‘(3) Questions about Church and State, or Church and science, or Church and society, are really questions about the adjustment between principles in themselves and their practical application. The needs of society always seem simple and easy of settlement: really they have to be gradually incorporated into a complex organism by a process of adjustment which looks like struggle. Take education, for instance. It seems easy to procure it on purely utilitarian grounds; but you would wish it to contain principles of knowledge, capable of expansion, *i.e.* you have a system of psychology and of mental philosophy, which are not understood or appreciated by the masses. If you stated your system you would be regarded as a pedant; so you fall in with popular demand, and try to make it more intelligent where and how you can.

'(4) This is what the Church does about everything. It has principles about every part of life : many hold those principles pedantically : in many points their system is too abstract ; it is always undergoing silent modifications. Yet there must be a system of some sort ; and it cannot rapidly change in its outward appearance—else the sense of system would disappear.

'(5) I really think that the intimate connexion of the Church of England with national life works this change in a remarkably real way. You see one side, I see another. You see the theoretical differences : I see the practical adaptation.

'(6) People will always differ about the permanence of existing tendencies of thought, the value of its apparent results. You must expect the Church to err on the side of caution.'

To Mr. W. S. Lilly

(in answer to his criticism of the Bishop's views about Sir Thomas More)

'Peterborough : October 20, 1896.

. . . 'You will think me very inconsistent if I say that I agree with what you say in answer to my remarks. It is the answer of the practical historian to the ideal historian ; of one who is tracing human affairs in relation to human character to one who is dealing with ideas. It is obvious that the great difficulty which besets any man in a high position is to be true in all his actions to the best he knows. Ideas struggle into recognition in spite of human weakness. Men are perpetually seeing more than they can realise. It is not rare in history to find cases of the perception of ideal truth, with incapacity to act up to it. Now the sixteenth century was a period of which the tragic interest lies in that fact. Insight into great truths and literary expression of them were common : yet never was consistent righteousness rarer. I do not blame the men as men : I feel the awful tragedy too near to my own experience. What I wrote about More, I wrote with the feeling "*De te fabula narratur*." I was writing as a religious teacher, not as a philosophic historian. I had before me eternal verities, not human conditions. More was to me an example of the law warring in our members. Can there be any real liberalism ? Do we not lay down principles infinitely greater than we can apply ? For More as a man I have the same regard that you have. He was the best man of his time. But in a sermon he became to me like Elijah, and I was regarding him as against a background of eternal truth.'

To a young friend

‘Peterborough : October 24, 1896.

‘I was very glad to hear from you, that you have been diligently [pursuing] a line in life. We all need an object, which should be definite from the first, but capable of being abandoned if need be. So many people fritter themselves away. I think it comes from vanity more than from indolence. They do not think they will become excellent, so they drop any definite pursuit, and become superior persons.

‘Don’t you think the world may be divided into two classes ?

‘(1) Those who do things because they take care and pains.

‘(2) Superior persons who do nothing themselves, but find fault with what other people do.

‘Yet both are necessary. It would be useless for shoemakers to make shoes which fitted no-one ; only the remonstrances of irate customers teach them what to do. . . .’

To the Rev. Canon Scott Holland

‘Peterborough : December 2, 1896.

‘Dear Holland,—I think I can tell you my mind about ——. It seems to me very inadvisable that his most useful career should be wrecked. I would treat him as I have treated others who have made mistakes—if he was submitted to me for any post, I would satisfy myself of his fitness for it, and deal with him accordingly. But I should regard him as on probation for a time. And I should plainly tell him my opinion about the past, and would expect a certain amount of acceptance of my opinion on his part.

‘I do not care about the exact matter on which he left his former work. That is not the point. The point is, that it is the mark of an undisciplined character to throw up a position because you cannot get all your own way. This absence of self-discipline, this excess of self-assertion, is the great bane of the present day. Any ruler of the Church must see that it does not infect himself, or any good men whom he has, to rule. It is the form of the world-spirit which has always been most powerful, and infects good people often in proportion to their goodness. To my mind a clergyman who through lack of self-control gives way to drink is in the same position as a clergyman who through petulance will not work in the position which God has assigned to him. To confuse little things with great issues is an unfortunate legacy of our Church just at present. It is disappearing, but it must make haste to go. There is no more ludicrous sight than the man

who thinks that "Catholic Faith and Catholic practice" are locked up in his own bosom, and will submit to no authority save that of his own sweet will. Such a man fosters in others a spirit of *ἀνομία* which is entirely contrary to the Spirit of God

'I believe — is Christian enough and man enough to recognise that. You are at liberty to show him this letter if you think it wise to do so. A bishop does not get his own way: he does not seek it. We cannot restore the order of the Church by going, each of us, our own way. I ask nothing save loyalty to the Prayer-book services, and confidence in my own desire to be perfectly fair. But he must be ready to trust me; he may have his own opinion about my wisdom.'

To a young friend ¹

‘Peterborough.

'Religion means the knowledge of our destiny and of the means of fulfilling it.

'It is not one out of many explanations of life: it is life itself. An old writer said truly "Heaven is first a temper and then a place."

'We must prepare to live in some region or another; it is the highest object of knowledge to know in what region our real life is placed.

'Religion is not a luxury, it is a necessity.

'We all have to live: the question is, how, and why, are we living?

'Everyone really lives on some sort of principle, even if he refuses to acknowledge it.

'If he feels that his principles are unworthy, he shrinks from formulating them.

'The claim of Christianity lies in the fact that it is the most complete explanation of life, and supplies the means of living the life which it sets forth.

'It is not to be judged by those who fail to be all that they wish to be, any more than art is to be judged by those who paint inferior pictures.

'You may judge in a sense of what anyone is: you do not know what they might have been if they had not used some means of discipline.

'If you would judge with any attempt at fairness, you should look at the best instances of each kind.

¹ These aphorisms were sent to a friend who had spoken to him about the difficulty of faith, when the lives of those who professed much religion seemed so unworthy.

‘The individual is expressed in character.

‘Character is an atmosphere rather than a sum of qualities.

‘It is revealed in crises. The great marks of character are teachableness and a capacity for growth.

‘Happiness consists in growing into a larger and larger world, with increased faculties of comprehension.

‘This involves a constant effort ; it is failure to be unequal to this effort.

‘Unhappiness generally comes from forming for ourselves an ideal, which experience destroys.

‘We must have in ourselves the power of replacing it by a larger one.

‘The Christian, through submission to God, is constantly growing out of selfish ideals into a perception of the world as God’s world.

‘But this process is never completed here. All he can hope to do is to carry away the rudiments of a teachable soul to face the knowledge of hereafter.’

CHAPTER VI

APPOINTMENT TO LONDON

AFTER the death of Archbishop Benson, Dr. Creighton was one of those most frequently mentioned in the newspapers and elsewhere as likely to be the new archbishop. The 'Spectator' spoke of him as 'having been generally regarded as Archbishop Benson's successor,' but he neither expected nor wished it himself. A few days after Dr. Temple's appointment as archbishop, Dr. Creighton received the following letter from Lord Salisbury :

' Hatfield House : October 28, 1896.

' My dear Lord,—I have the Queen's authority for asking you whether you will be willing to accept translation to the See of London, which, as you are aware, is vacant by the recent appointment to the archbishopric of Canterbury. I need not urge upon you the arguments and considerations by which you should be guided in deciding on such a step as this. There is probably no one in Christendom whose mind is better equipped for appreciating the importance of the work to which you are invited, or the injury which an ill-considered refusal might inflict upon the Church. I doubt not that her interests will be your first thought.

' Believe me, yours very truly,

' SALISBURY.'

His appointment was received with unanimous and warm approval. I give a few extracts from the many letters of congratulation which poured in upon him :

From Dr. Randall Davidson, Bishop of Winchester

' November 2, 1896.

' . . . Need I say how loyally and heartily we shall all of us back you up, and with what confidence we shall trust your judgment in the problems you have to face as the protagonist amongst us younger men ? You will be overwhelmed just now with the glad letters of all who realise what need there is for courage and power and level-headed common

sense and largeness of sympathy and steadiness of purpose, in the occupant of Fulham at such a juncture in the Church's history.'

From Dr. Talbot, Bishop of Rochester 'November 2, 1896.

' . . . One thing only I regret, viz. The size and weight of the extinguisher put upon your study : still even there you have your knowledge in hand. . . . It is very moving to me to think that we two old friends should (with dear St. Albans) have this great London work committed to us. As I write the words, something of its appalling greatness and seriousness rushes over me. . . . There must, I think, be ways in which we ought to be able to work together for the unity of the Church in London. Think of me as something between a colleague and a lieutenant in all that you seek to do.'

From the Rev. Canon Scott Holland 'November 2.

' My dear Friend,—All our arms are open to receive you, as you know well. The old dome is alive with delight. It knows you so well already. . . . This big place cries out not only for noble drudgery, but also for a *Chief*, who is at least far enough out of the smoke to see how the battle goes.'

From Dr. Guinness Rogers 'November 5.

' Dear Lord Bishop,—I venture as a minister of another church to address to you a brief congratulation on your recent appointment. I am a stranger to your Lordship, though a very sincere admirer of your great work on the history of the Papacy, which it was a pleasure to review. But I am encouraged to write by your fraternal message to the Congregational Union at Leicester. I was privileged and honoured by being asked to express the cordial sentiments of the assembly in reply. So now I take the opportunity of expressing the satisfaction with which, in common with numbers of my brethren, I view an elevation which, while it is only a fitting acknowledgment of your distinguished services, holds out the prospect of more kindly relations between your own Church and the Free Churches of the metropolis.'

The following letters show a little of what the Diocese of Peterborough felt :

From the Rev. Canon Alderson 'November 2.

' Of course I knew perfectly well that when the Archbishop died we should lose you, but now the blow has

actually fallen, it seems very hard to bear. You have no doubt seen all that the papers say about you, and what they say of your short reign at Peterborough is all true, but they do not know what a delightful neighbour those who live in the Precincts are about to lose.'

From the Rev. Canon Hull

'Northampton : November 2.

' Our best wishes are yours : but alas for ourselves ! Your coming here gave a new happiness to the work in this diocese, such as I never thought possible before you came. And now I feel as if I never wished to enter the Palace again when you and Mrs. Creighton are no longer there.'

From the Duke of Rutland

' November 4.

' London's gain is our loss, and were I to fill sheets of paper I could only amplify that expression of my feelings on this occasion. . . . I condole with the whole diocese you are leaving on what I fear will prove an irreparable loss. It is no exaggeration to say that during your episcopate here you have won, and deservedly, the hearts of clergy and laity alike. . . . I remain your grateful and faithful friend,
' RUTLAND.'

From Mr. H. Labouchere, M.P.

' November 2.

' I cannot help being one of the many who no doubt have congratulated you on your translation, for which the metropolis may also congratulate itself. I was at Northampton last week, and my Radical supporters were enthusiastic about your address on Russia.'

From the Rev. J. T. Lawrance

' Giron : December 5.

' The time that I spent at Nailstone under your episcopal jurisdiction was the happiest period of clerical work I have ever experienced. Guidance, direction and progress were in the air. There was a very real sense of belonging to a great organisation which was conscious of the social needs of the times, and was endeavouring to apply to them the principles of the Gospel of Jesus Christ.'

A friend who was travelling north on November 2 wrote : ' An old porter at Peterborough came up to me to-day with a picture of you. " Do you know him, sir ? " " Yes, well. " " Ah, I'm sorry we've to lose him. Though he deserves all they can give him, and so does his missus. " '

The Bishop answered as many as possible of his letters with his own hand. I give a few of his answers :

To Mrs. T. H. Ward

‘ Peterborough : October 24, 1896.

‘ My dear Mary,— Louise showed me your touching letter, which is just like all you think and write—so penetratingly and sympathetically true. Personally, I shrink from fresh responsibility, and I think I can truly say that I am free from ambition . . . I have never acted, I think I can say, from any personal consideration ; and my reputation is always a surprise to myself. I never tried to make a hit, and never consider anything but the need for simplicity and straightforwardness. But I am writing a panegyric of myself. I only wished to say that I want nothing, and aspire to nothing. The small things of life are to me more important than the large ones—love and sympathy, and the power of sometimes saying or doing what may help others. Those are the true contents of life, and they may be practised anywhere. The power is not one’s own—more and more we all feel that we are the creatures of something behind ourselves, which speaks through us ; and all that we can do is not to allow our own wilfulness to stand between ourself and the message with which we are charged. I have been very busy or would have written to you before about “ Sir George.” I am delighted that it has been so successful. I hear on many sides testimony to the interest which it has excited. Just the point on which I doubted—its political motive—has proved to be the most attractive. You were right and I was wrong. I did not know that the personal side of politics would appeal to the public mind ; but it has. I find that one is no judge of one’s friends’ books : one is not sufficiently detached from the source from which they spring, and follows too much the process of their genesis to judge of their cumulative effect. In fact, I read your books with my primary interest in you, and so lose the dramatic effect of movement in the personages. Your books may be good, but you are so much better that you dissolve them for me into modes of yourself.

‘ After that it is time to leave off. Much love to you all.’

To Dr. Guinness Rogers

‘ The Palace, Peterborough : November 9, 1896.

‘ My dear Sir,—I am very grateful to you for your message of welcome to London. It will be my earnest endeavour that brotherly love should bind together all the followers of our common Lord and Master.’

To the Rev. Canon Hull

‘Heaton Rise, Bradford : November 13, 1896.

‘My dear Hull,—I am very sorry to have to leave my Diocese. I have no ambition ; I never could see how anyone could have such a quality. But we must all go where we are sent, and must do our best by God’s help.

‘There is no one from whom I part with greater sorrow than you. All our relations have been on a basis of affection, and I cannot thank you enough for all your help . . . ’

To Count Balzani

‘Peterborough : November 18, 1896.

‘My dear Balzani,—You will know that I am not delighted to be again moved, and sent to the most arduous work in the Church. I think it was Dean Stanley who said that next to the Bishopric of Rome, the Bishopric of London was the most important position in Christendom. I feel that it is to some degree true, and I have no personal wish for increased responsibility. But we are not our own masters, nor are we, any of us, allowed to dispose of our own lives. I must go and do my best. The family were all plunged in woe at first, but we are growing more reconciled. Fulham is a nice place. I think you may tell the children that they will find more room there than at Peterborough. However, there is no cathedral next door, which is a serious omission.

‘Of course I am plunged in business. To wind up one set of affairs and enter upon another is serious in itself, and all periods of transition are embarrassing. When I have done all I can I mean to flee for ten days at the beginning of December, perhaps to Hyères, as the nearest place where one can be decently warm.

To the Rev. Canon Scott Holland

‘Peterborough : November 12, 1896.

‘My dear Holland,—You are a dear man who has the knack of saying helpful things. When I came to Peterborough you pointed out the usefulness of a bishop saying and doing little things outside his ordinary business ; and you said how weighty they were, coming from him. I have often thought of your words and their wisdom—I have been more useful, and have gained more influence, by never being in too great a hurry to do little things, that were not obviously my duty, than in any other way.

‘Now I feel the truth of your warning not to rest satisfied with the drudgery of my office. I have a strong feeling that a bishop ought not to be merely an ecclesiastical official, but

a link between various classes and various activities. He ought to try to make all sorts of things converge, so that the standard and efficiency of each is heightened.'

To the Bishop of Colombo

'Peterborough : December 1, 1896.

'My dear Brother,—We little thought in old days what was in store for us. Certainly I never wished for the office of bishop, or thought myself qualified for it. That I should have to rule the most important see in Christendom seems to me quite ridiculous. But we can only go where we are sent, and do what we are bidden. And I know that you will help me by your prayers. It is on leaving one sphere of work for another that one receives some comfort from the sense that others say they have profited by the little one has done. It is a deplorable thing to leave one diocese and go to another. In my case it means an entire loss of peace and quietness for the future. I could sit down and howl with anguish over the prospect. Everything was so sudden. The Archbishop's death was a terrible shock, and no one had thought of the future. His loss will not be made good for a long time ; and we all feel out of gear. I hope we may have recovered again before the Conference. The only alleviation to London is that it brings friends nearer ; and I feel that some human sympathy in that great wilderness is necessary. . . . However, I must do my best ;

Man's the work is, the consequence God's.

'The dear Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, wrote to me very characteristically, "The parable does not say that the servant who was set over ten cities managed them well ; but doubtless the King had good reason for his choice."

'At present I feel that the Church does not need great exploits, but a gradually drawing together of its children ; and a larger activity in influencing the world, not from without by organisation, but by the quickening power of "the little leaven." The world dimly feels a need of the Church : and the Church must leave little matters for great ones.'

To the Rev. H. R. Haweis

'The Palace, Peterborough : December 23, 1896.

'... I shall, I fear, disappoint many expectations in my difficult office. But of this I am sure, that I shall not err through want of sympathy with all forms of Christian thought and all endeavours to set forth the Gospel to the world. Time alone can decide among them : and the more a man is

sure of his own position, the less will he wish to force it upon others, and the more he will trust to the inherent power of truth.'

As far as possible the Bishop tried to cancel engagements so as to get time for the necessary arrangements connected with the move to London, but there remained many things that he was bound to do.

To his niece Winifred

'November 9, 1896.

'I have been staying at Sandringham with the Prince of Wales to celebrate his birthday, which is to-day. We were a large party, including Lord Salisbury, and his son Lord Hugh Cecil, Mr. Balfour, Lady Randolph Churchill, and all sorts of people. It was rather nice, as I had many talks with everybody. The Duke of Saxe-Coburg was there also, and Prince George of Denmark, and Princess Maud, and the Duke and Duchess of Fife: all very nice and simple, and yesterday afternoon I was careering round the Hall with the Duke of York's eldest son on my shoulder, and Lord Salisbury looking at my agility with amazement.

'I am bored to death with letters and things to do. Of course departure to London means winding up much work, and beginning more. . . . I shall be hopelessly ruined before I settle in. That is the worst of an official position, you are ruined on every side and can save nothing. I look at my children and wonder what is to become of them. They must find that out for themselves.'

'November 29, 1896.

'Now I am on a visit to the Queen; preached to her this morning; dined with her last night, and had a long talk. She is very interesting to talk to, and is now very friendly with me, and talks about everything.'

Just at the time when it seemed that all thought of historical work must be definitely given up, he received the following letter from Lord Acton:

'Trinity College: November 16, 1896.

'My dear Creighton,—I do not write to congratulate you, because I would rather congratulate others on your immense opportunities for doing good than you on the threatened loss of leisure for writing. Nevertheless I have to bring an important matter before you.

'The Press Syndics have undertaken to publish a general history of modern times in a series of large volumes.

They made me draw up a scheme, which they adopted, and they expect me to find the men, and then to ride on the whirlwind . . . the thing we most require, the thing we require first, is your sanction and assistance. . . . Your place is evidently in the first chapter of the first volume . . . that introduction, on the mediæval roots of modern history, must be about fifty pages. That is what I ask of you in the name of the university and of our long friendship. Tell me what else there is in the first two volumes that should be assigned to you.'

Dr. Creighton to Lord Acton

'November 18, 1896.

'My dear Acton,—Alas, life closes round me in ways which I do not wish, and I doubt if I shall ever have time to read or write again.

'Your project fills me with interest, and I will do my utmost to fulfil your wishes, because they are yours. I could not entertain such a proposal from anyone else: but you are one whom we must all try to obey. So much I learn from hierarchical habits. But I do not know why you should think that I am specially competent to undertake the mighty task of summing up the Middle Ages and their legacy to modern times. I should have thought the Bishop of Oxford would have been the man. I have no chance of ever thinking of anything till August next, if I am still alive.

'Your prospectus is admirable, and the book would be of enormous value. I hope that you intend to write much of it yourself. I wish I had a chance of a visit to Cambridge, but you will conceive that I am very busy at present, and I propose to go abroad for ten days at the beginning of next month. I can only send you such suggestions as strike me [he adds a list of possible writers]. I have not yet expressed in all my ramblings my admiration for the greatness of your undertaking. It will indeed be a mighty work; and what is still more important, it will bring under your influence and supervision all the men in England who are engaged in historical writing. The effect of this to raise the standard will be enormous. I envy you the opportunity, and still more the capacity to use it, as you alone can do.'

Lord Acton to Dr. Creighton

'Trinity College: November 20, 1896.

'My dear Creighton,—Your reply to my petition is an encouragement and an heirloom, and I cannot tell you how much it strengthens my hands and improves our prospects.

Your opening chapter will give dignity and public confidence to the work.'

It proved, however, impossible for the Bishop to write the proposed chapter in time for the issue of the first volume, and he was obliged in 1898 to tell Lord Acton that he must give up the attempt.

Lord Acton to Dr. Creighton 'Trinity College : May 15, 1898.

'My dear Creighton,—I am not thinking of asking you to reconsider your decision, for I know how hard you are worked, and am not so untrue to our friendship as to wish to increase your cares.

'They wish me to do the first chapter in your stead. . . . I had intended to write an introduction . . . the loss of your name and aid is a serious blow to us. . . . So I want you to write the introduction and inaugurate the undertaking ; you are so pre-eminently the man for it, by your present dignity as well as by your former connexion with history at Cambridge, and with the Review. It will be a great assistance to us, and I hope no heavy burden to you. . . . *Vagliami il lungo studio e 'l grande amore.*'

The Bishop could not refuse this request, and wrote an Introductory Note which appears in the first volume of the Cambridge history.¹

On December 3rd we went to a quiet hotel at Hyères, and spent our days rambling on the hills or by the shore. Then he came back for his last Ordination at Peterborough.

To Rev. H. Orford (in S. Africa)

'Peterborough : December 24, 1896.

'I have been long in answering your letter ; but you may imagine I have been overwhelmed with correspondence. I went to the Riviera for a fortnight's holiday and took your letter with me ; but I never put pen to paper and simply vegetated. I am very sorry to leave Peterborough, and had no wish to go to London. However, I shall have to do my best. There is so much to do that everything may be done, and I can only do what I can. It is a great struggle to wind up here, and I have not yet begun to understand what I can do in London.

'Much has been happening in England this year. The

¹ The proposed first chapter was never written. Lord Acton died without having begun it, and the History had to appear without it.

Pope's letter has not had the result which Vaughan expected. It has reinforced Protestantism and made the position of Anglicanism more definite. It has forced people to consider more clearly the points on which we differ from Rome. My visit to Moscow has given prominence to the Eastern Church. We are learning to behave more sensibly to the nonconformists. I was greatly surprised that, when I wrote a kindly letter to the Congregational Union which met at Leicester, none of my clergy wrote to remonstrate and no Church paper abused me. If I can introduce courtesy and good feeling into our relationships with nonconformists I shall make a real contribution to the future.

'On the other hand, education and marriage questions remain where they were, or even look worse.

We were a large party for Christmas, as his nephews and nieces, and other young people, came to spend the holidays with us. On January 8 we kept our silver wedding. He wrote to Lady Lilford the day afterwards.

'Peterborough : January 9, 1897.

'My dear Lady Lilford,—I am sorry to hear, though it is but natural, that all you have gone through has affected your health. In a sense it is a relief to you that nature prescribes quiet, and that the body should share with the suffering of the mind. Ah well, we can all of us write dispassionately of another's case, but it is of little avail. I feel sad enough at the severance of many ties, the bidding of farewells, the attempts to wind up business: yet these come to me on an occasion which is to most people one of congratulation. How much more must it have been to you, when new duties are not prescribed and have to be slowly found, and life seems left without direction, and strength and vigour seem to have departed. . . .

'Yesterday we kept our silver wedding. I am almost ashamed to think how happy my life has been as yet. Doubtless, my days of trial are to come.'

Our Peterborough friends took the opportunity of our silver wedding to give us many beautiful remembrances of the happy time we had spent among them, and all came to congratulate us and bid us farewell on the afternoon of the day. In the evening the Bishop was much touched by a little performance of songs and recitations, composed and acted by our children, illustrating the different events of our

married life. The tears came into his eyes as he sat and watched them.

To Miss Lilian Fitzroy

‘Peterborough: January 8, 1897.

‘On Monday I leave Peterborough never to return as Bishop. However, I ought not to repine, as to-day is my silver wedding, and I can look back on twenty-five years of very happy married life, and have all my children well and happy round me. But it is an awful nuisance going away to new work; and I shall become a more important person, which is a bore. But you especially must promise that you won’t cut me in London, and will sometimes come and cheer me up: and will believe that I am never too busy to talk to you and read and answer your letters.

The Bishop bade farewell in person to many of his clergy. There were gatherings in Leicester, Northampton and Peterborough, where he united with them in special celebrations of Holy Communion, and met them and addressed them afterwards at breakfast. To them all he sent the following letter:

‘The Palace, Peterborough: January 6, 1897.

‘Rev. and dear Brother,—Now that I have been elected Bishop of London, the time has come when I must bid farewell to those with whom I have worked for nearly six years. It is a very brief space in the history of a diocese, but it is a most important period in the history of a life. To me it has been an opportunity of seeing the work of Christ’s Church within the sphere allotted to my supervision, of knowing the power of quiet lives devoted to Christ’s service, and of learning many lessons from the experience of others. I will not speak to you of the work done in the diocese, or of any plans or projects which I made. Such things must be judged by their results in the eyes of God. I will only thank you for the kindness and confidence with which you have treated me, for the intimacy which you have permitted me to assume, for the readiness with which you have sought my advice, and the loyalty which you have always shown towards me. I can truly say that I have been conscious of no parties, have met with no suspicion, and have always been able to count on your hearty co-operation. Doubtless I have made errors in judgment in my administration, but you have recognised the difficulties of my position and have trusted my fundamental desire to be just. For all your kindness and for all that you have taught me, I thank you from the bottom of my heart.

‘My sorrow at leaving this diocese is not regret for organisation left unfinished, or projects unrealised ; it is the pain of severance of personal friendships. I bid farewell to fellow-labourers in the highest object of man’s endeavour—fellow-labourers who were dear to me not only for their work’s sake, but for themselves. You will ever have a place in my prayers, and I would commend myself very earnestly to yours. I would ask you, as the last kindness you can show me as your Bishop, to use the enclosed prayer in your church so long as I remain Bishop of this diocese.

‘And now I bid you farewell, and commend you to God and the word of His Grace, which is able to build you up.

‘Your faithful brother in Christ,
‘M. PETRIBURG.’

He was presented with an illuminated address bound in a handsome volume, and signed by all the clergy in the diocese save one, who wrote to the Bishop to say that he had not signed it because he could not believe that anyone would wish to be addressed in such fulsome terms. The address was as follows :

‘My Lord,—We cannot permit you to sever your connexion with this diocese without an expression of sincere regret at your departure from among us.

‘Your tenure of the See has been short, but in these few years you have been so constantly moving among us, that we have all learned to know you and feel your personal influence ; and we gladly seize this opportunity of thanking you for the unsparing way in which you have devoted yourself to express appreciative sympathy with our efforts.

‘You succeeded a bishop endowed with splendid gifts : you have carried on the tradition of greatness. The brilliant and versatile talents with which God has enriched you, and which have been so constantly and assiduously used in the interest of religion and culture, have shed lustre on this Diocese ; and we have felt justly proud of our Bishop. Nor is it a small thing to say that Peterborough has within six years sent one of her prelates to York, and his immediate successor to London.

We would gladly have kept you with us, but we recognise that your translation to a larger sphere is for the good of the Church. But, while we thus unfeignedly regret your departure from us, we heartily wish you God speed, and pray that His guidance may direct, and His blessing prosper, your work in

that vast diocese, with its almost terrible responsibilities, to which His Providence now calls you.

‘We are, my Lord, your Lordship’s dutiful Sons and Servants in Christ.’

In some notes in the ‘Diocesan Magazine,’ on his departure, the admiration for his work was expressed with equal warmth.

‘We smaller men marvel how a man with the burden of an English diocese on his shoulders could find the time, to say nothing of the brains, to prepare adequately for sermons at St. Paul’s, before the Court, in the University pulpits, and could, in one and the same year¹ be Rede Lecturer at Cambridge and Romanes Lecturer at Oxford.

‘For, be it remembered, his diocese never suffered amid all this extraneous effort. He was here and there and everywhere, in our three counties, preaching, confirming, addressing, lecturing. If we did complain, it was that he made himself too cheap in this respect, and did not draw the line a little higher up than at harvest thanksgivings.

‘As a lecturer he will long be remembered . . . one hardly knew which to admire most, the profound erudition and grasp of subject, or the exquisite lucidity with which it was treated.

‘We shall miss him too at our Diocesan Conference; never interfering with or seeking to influence the freedom of debate, his opening addresses were masterly, and in his summing up *rem acu tetigit*.

‘He has ruled his diocese well and justly; he has dispensed his patronage carefully and fairly. Many of us have much reason to acknowledge the open-handed hospitality and unvarying kindness with which we have been welcomed at the Palace; and all who have been brought in contact with him will remember with pleasure the frank and unaffected courtesy which has characterised his intercourse with them. Perhaps the young folk of the diocese will miss him most of all. He will forgive us when we say that he has never quite ceased to be a big boy; and with children he was always at his ease, as they were with him; and all the youngsters, male or female, that have had the advantage of a romp with him, have found out what a delightful creature a Bishop can be in spite of his apron and gaiters.’

I add some remarks by clergy who worked under him:

‘Many of all classes have to thank him for having raised their whole ideal both of the capabilities of the bishop’s office

¹ Really, in two consecutive years.

and work, and of the ways in which both clergy and laity can help their own bishop to make full use of them. Those who responded to him felt that they were working under a kindly but penetrating and stimulating influence which gave them every encouragement and yet tested them, which above all would not allow them, if it could be helped, to relapse into what was narrow and conventional.’¹

‘One of the most marked results of his short episcopate at Peterborough was the advance of church life and activity among prominent laymen. He knew them all; they could not help loving him personally. They got to believe he cared for them, and they trusted his judgment. This was a great factor in smoothing difficulties between the schools of thought. All schools felt they had a friend in the Bishop. We had almost no ritual controversies in the diocese during his rule. We got closer together in our common affection for him, and quarrelled very little. “I can forgive a layman who quarrels with his vicar,” Dr. Creighton said to me once, “but I cannot forgive a vicar who is foolish enough to quarrel with his people.”’²

There were not many troublesome questions for the Bishop to hand on to his successor. When he looked through the letters which he had kept, he found that all except one small packet might be destroyed. He parted from a loyal and affectionate clergy, leaving his diocese in perfect peace.

The Bishop’s relations with the city of Peterborough had always been of the most happy nature. In replying to the resolution of congratulation sent him by the City Council, he said :

‘I can truly say that during my residence in Peterborough I have tried to remember that my official duties as Bishop of the diocese did not absolve me from my special duties as a citizen of Peterborough, and I am glad to think that my relations with the Corporation have been of a cordial nature. . . . Perhaps I may be allowed to add, that I have been struck as an interested observer, with the way in which the business of the City Council has been transacted, with a single eye to the public welfare in a uniform spirit of courtesy and fairness.

‘The hope of the future depends on the maintenance and development of capacity and zeal in the service of local

¹ Canon (now Archdeacon) Stocks.

² Rev. E. Grose Hodge.

government. That these qualities will never be wanting in Peterborough is my hope and trust.'

Something of his inmost mind at this time is shown by the following letter to an old friend, who wrote saying :

'Will you forgive me if after many years of silence I again write to you about myself. . . . I have tried for many years now to live without religion, but I don't feel I've made a success of it so far. . . . If I wanted to know about music or about engineering I should ask someone who really *knew* about these things, and the only people who *know* about faith are the people who *have* felt and *do* feel it. . . .'

'The Palace, Peterborough : December 21, 1896.

' . . . The mere fact that I could not write till I asked if I might write so [with the old frankness] seems to go to the very root of the question which I write about. What is life? You may say, It is the development of my capacities, the process of finding a self, of becoming all I can be. But how is this to be tested? How do I know what I am? The only answer is, Life is a sum of relationships. There is no independent or self-centred existence. I am what I am in relation to others : and I know myself by seeing myself reflected in my influence on others, my power of touching their lives and weaving their life and mine into some connected and satisfactory scheme, which contains them all and points to further developments. This process is satisfactory, and gives happiness in proportion as it is large, real, and gives hopes of permanence. The Christian claim is that my life, my capacities, my relationships are part of an eternal order running through the universe, beginning and ending in God. Nothing short of this conception gives happiness or strength or reality. It is a conception which entirely corresponds to the needs of human nature, and its great proof must always be this correspondency.

'You are quite right in saying that religion is a matter for the expert in it. It cannot be otherwise. The truth of Christianity is apparent in the Christian life : and all the conceptions which support the non-Christian at the present day are of Christian origin, and owe their power to the vitality of the Christian faith. Current morality, philanthropy, high aims in politics, ideas of progress, of liberty, of brotherhood—what you will—owe their position to Christianity. Begin to discuss and examine them in the pure light of reason : there is no reason for the family, for marriage, for any part

of the moral law, for any claim of any principle to be dominant over my natural desire to gratify my impulses as they arise. The criticism directed against Christianity is equally strong, indeed stronger, against any other conception on which society can be founded. In fact, pure reason leads nowhere. It is not a beginning. We act from the heart first, then the head explains. What can be more irrational than love? Yet it is the motive power of the individual life. Take the excellent man, who is not a Christian, but has noble ideals. It is not the cogency of his intellectual statement which attracts you, but his obvious sincerity, his zeal, his fire, his passion. Where do these come from? Not from his intellectual system, which cannot supply them, but from the Christian atmosphere which surrounds him. Christ was "the light of *the world*," not only of the Church. Men cannot escape from Him. He will judge them, not according to the utterances of their head, but to the obedience of their heart.

'But this is going on too fast. Let me go back. Life is only explicable as part of a general purpose. Every high-minded man explains it so. The only question is, How large is his purpose? The Christian purpose is unlimited, infinite. Can this be justified?

'Our life is the development of our personality. This personality is something more than the sum total of our observed qualities. One man with many gifts which can be recognised is somehow still unattractive and ineffective. Another, less richly endowed, whose qualities cannot be separately appraised so highly, is much more influential and obviously leads a richer life. Why? Because he is more of a person, is more consistent, has a central source of power. We may call this personality.

'Now the great question about oneself is the formation and nurture of this central point of our being, this personality. This thought explains and justifies the nature of the revelation of God in Christ. God could be known in nature, in conscience, in history; but if He was to be thoroughly known, He must be known in a *person*. So Christ stands the central fount of personality, who explains, not my gifts, my attainments, my knowledge, my capacities, but *me*, that which lies beyond these, uses them and gives them meaning and coherence.

'So He stands, the Sustainer of all men: and I am led to Him by all my experience. What makes me in this world? My relations to others. What cheers me? The belief that

some at least love me. What gives me any value in my own eyes? The sense of my influence over, and usefulness to, one or two of those who love me. Without love and confidence on both sides all this world would be useless. I should be nothing, do nothing, enjoy nothing.

‘Relationships, founded on a sense of lasting affection, are the sole realities of life.

‘This is obvious. It is the burden of all literature. It leads straight to Christ. Faith is personal trust in a person. Christianity does not call upon me to commit myself to something contrary to my experience. It asks me to discover its law already written in the world. In Christ all becomes plain. In my relationship towards Him all my other relationships find their meaning and their security.

‘I will not go further now. This is an outside view, but perhaps you will understand it. In such matters conviction does not come from outside, but from within. The felt need comes first : slowly we find how to supply it.

‘Let me venture to speak of yourself. As I knew you, you had a delicate, fine, perceptive nature ; but it was too receptive of things as they offered themselves, and shrank from much trouble. You took all that came to you, enjoyed them to the full, but did not care to appropriate them more than was convenient. Life was made easy to you. . . . You had the opportunity of indulging your capacity for receiving impressions, and you had further so much natural charm and attractiveness that you could get from everybody whatever you wished. You won’t think me hard if I say that one of the great dangers of such as you is that, both to yourself and all around you, it seems so natural that you should have and do what you wish, that selfishness is hidden and condoned by its gracefulness and charm.

‘But the enjoyment of this protected life comes to an end. Duties gather round one and are imperative. One gets wearied of social enjoyments which have no contents, intimacies which reveal nothing, admiration which gives no real power for any definite purpose. One finds oneself with certain relationships thrust upon one, some chosen and very dear, yet with a vague discontent and with a sense that there is more to be made out of them if one only saw how. I have been writing to show you my answer, I cannot do more. I know what I have to do and I know how much I fail to do it. It is not public recognition which cheers me, but the love of simple souls, who teach me more than I teach them, and give me glimpses of much beyond and above. I can

truly say that I am happy, not through my public activities, or my social powers, but through growing sympathy in little matters with children, with the young, with the sorrowful, the tempted, the perplexed. Always I see a great purpose, God fulfilling Himself in divers ways.

‘I did not mean to write about myself. This letter has been written with numerous interruptions: and I dare say it is incoherent. But you will read it with sympathy.’

The Bishop’s first act on coming into his diocese had been to consecrate a new church at Leicester, his last act before leaving it was to lay, on January 11, the foundation stones of two new churches at North Evington and Knighton Fields, both outlying districts of Leicester. At the public lunch afterwards he spoke of the deep interest and growing affection which he had felt for Leicester, and how he had striven to identify himself as much as possible with the municipal life of the town. He said: ‘I am certain that the Church has a great work to do in associating itself with public life. . . . I am absolutely convinced of the necessity that all public life and all municipal life should be penetrated by the spirit of the Gospel.’

Leicester thoroughly valued him and his work. One who knows the town well says that he is the only Bishop who has ever got hold of Leicester. As a mark of friendship, the Leicester people collected a considerable sum of money which was given to the Bishop with the request that he would use it to buy pictures¹ to adorn his London house. He replied: ‘I should like anything which I received from Leicester to be a memorial which I could hand down to my children: for I shall be very proud of it.’

To his niece Ella Creighton

‘Fryth,² Berkhamsted: January 24, 1897.’

‘Perhaps you think I ought to have written to you before, but the difficulties of a houseless wanderer are great. If one stays with people one has to talk to them. Since I said good-bye to you I have been wandering. I went to Leicester, then to London, then to Farnham Castle. Then I went to Osborne,

¹ The Bishop was allowed to choose these pictures and bought eight oil paintings, which were a very great pleasure to him.

² The house of Mr. J. R. Thursfield.

where the Queen was very well and kind. Then I returned to London, and was plunged in business, whence I emerged with difficulty on Friday and came here for peace. I arrived in the middle of the snowstorm, and Louise, who meant to come on Saturday, gave it up for fear she should not get here. I am in a house on the verge of a hill, with a huge common extending for miles on the top. It is a charming place, but not quite adapted to snow, especially when it blows into drifts. However, Thursfield provided me with wading boots up to my knees and I roam about among the gorse and enjoy the wintry landscape. Here I am in peace except for letters, which pour. To-morrow I go back to London for a hard week's work, ending with my enthronement on Saturday. By that time I hope we shall be able to picnic in Fulham.'

The disturbance raised at his Confirmation in the church of St. Mary le Bow by Mr. Kensit, of whom till then he had never heard, was a surprise to the Bishop. Mr. Kensit objected to him because he had worn a mitre and because he had promoted persons considered by Mr. Kensit to be unfit. Mr. Kensit's attempt to read his protest produced a good deal of unseemly disturbance; the Vicar-General ruled that he could not be heard, a decision which was received with loud applause. On leaving the church Dr. Creighton saw Mr. Kensit at the door, and shook hands with him, saying that he was sure they would understand one another as they got to know one another.

By Friday, January 29, we were able to take up our abode at Fulham Palace, where all our children joined us for the enthronement on Saturday.

To Dr. G. F. Brown, then Bishop of Stepney and Canon of St. Paul's

'The Palace, Peterborough: January 8, 1897.

'My dear Bishop,—I feel that I ought to leave the arrangements for the enthronement in the hands of the Dean and Chapter. I will do what you tell me. But I feel that it would be better if there were no sermon or address from me. It is hardly the time for talking.'

The Bishop always loved his connexion with St. Paul's. He had a special appreciation for the genius of Wren, and considered St. Paul's Cathedral one of the great buildings of

the world. The reverence of its services and the beauty of its music completely satisfied his æsthetic sense. The ceremonial of his enthronement was ordered with all the simple dignity usual at St. Paul's on great occasions. There for the first time the Bishop met the Lord Mayor, then Mr. Faudel Phillips, with whom he was to be so much and so pleasantly associated during the busy year which followed. Friends gathered from every part of the country for the occasion. The ceremony of enthronement was followed by a celebration of the Holy Communion at which the Bishop was the celebrant.

The following Sunday he spent quietly at Fulham with his family.

To his niece Winifred

‘Fulham Palace : February 1, 1897.

‘I have now suffered all that is possible before getting to work, and am rejoicing in being settled in my own room, with all my papers round me and my secretary to help me. I was very nicely enthroned on Saturday, and was welcomed on Sunday in Fulham Church with much pomp, and was made to preach a sermon.’

CHAPTER VII

BEGINNINGS OF LONDON LIFE

THE nature of his new work made some changes in the Bishop's manner of life necessary. He had to engage a domestic chaplain ; but, in spite of his overwhelming correspondence, his dislike to complicating the machinery of life was so great, that he employed no other secretarial help, though he would occasionally dictate letters to his daughters. He could never be persuaded to use a shorthand secretary. Most of his letters he answered himself, writing with great rapidity, and at every possible moment of time, though never late at night. His regular letters to his nephews and nieces were generally written at the meetings of the Ecclesiastical Commission or of the Trustees of the British Museum, but this never prevented him from attending to the business that was going on.

He engaged as his chaplain the Rev. L. J. Percival, son of his old friend the Bishop of Hereford.

To the Rev. L. J. Percival ‘ Peterborough : November 20, 1896.

‘ My dear Mr. Percival,—I write to propose to you that you should act as my domestic chaplain when I become Bishop of London. I do not know if such a proposal would be acceptable to you ; but I should be very much pleased if it were so. I think we have met in times past and what I have heard of you from Mr. Glyn leads me to think that you would be useful to me. I may say that I have written to your father, and have his consent for making this proposal. I can only promise to give you plenty of work to do, and I will do my utmost to make it pleasant for you to do it. If you are inclined to consider my proposal, perhaps you could manage to come and see me some day next week.’

‘ November 24, 1896.

‘ I shall be at home on Friday morning. Come by all means, and we will have a talk, and you shall see the worst of us.’

Mr. Percival writes : ' I shall never forget the day when I went, in fear and trembling, to Peterborough to be inspected, but all that he wanted was to know if I thought *I* should be happy at Fulham. His words as I left for London were " Well, I hope you will like us." ' It was an amusing and unexpected experience to be asked on this visit of inspection to join in a game of hockey with the Bishop and his children.

The tie between Mr. Percival and the Bishop soon became one of strong affection and absolute confidence. Mr. Percival says that no chaplain was ever treated by his bishop with such confidence and consideration ; the Bishop regarded him as a fellow-worker rather than as a subordinate. This confidence was amply repaid, and no bishop was ever served with more loyal and devoted affection.

Fulham Palace is such a large and rambling house that the Bishop never learnt to find his way over it. The chapel was rather a grief to him ; all he could do to improve it was to put up his wooden reredos, which he brought from Peterborough. London House, the episcopal residence in St. James's Square, had never been inhabited by Dr. Temple. The Bishop was clear that he ought to live in it for part of the year, and as it was in a deplorable condition, Mr. Caröe, the diocesan architect, was instructed to put it in order. It was transformed internally, and made not only a convenient but a beautiful house. Special attention was paid to the room used as a chapel. Its walls were adorned with some interesting carved panelling which the Bishop discovered in a dismantled house at Fulham. The necessary changes in the house were so extensive that we were not able to inhabit it till 1898. For the first year the work had to be carried on entirely from Fulham. Much time was spent in getting in and out of London, but I do not think that it was wasted. The Bishop never read in his carriage, but he prepared his sermons or speeches. His conversation with his companion was often interrupted with ' Now I must make my sermon,' and a period of silence followed till he was ready for talk again. He used the District Railway a great deal, both to get into London and for his longer journeys about the diocese. Living in London House in many ways made his work easier, and the clergy were delighted to have their Bishop

more accessible, but in some ways it added to the strain. Engagements could follow so quickly one upon another as to leave not a moment's respite between, and people could drop in to see him at any time. At Fulham he could sometimes feel safe from interruption.

He tried to make it easy for his clergy to see him by spending every Monday morning at London House for interviews. Then he was visited by a continual stream of persons of all kinds. Some when their turn came thought his manner almost curt, so quickly did he cut the knot of their difficulty, and so little time did he give to further discussion when once the real question was settled. But if it was a subject that needed deliberation, he was never in a hurry, and in any real trouble his sympathy was never wanting. All alike were impressed with the quickness with which he pierced to the root of the matter and saw the real point at issue, as well as with the courtesy and kindness with which he treated them. He himself once expressed his ideal of such interviews. 'No man should ever leave our presence with the sense that we have not done our best to understand him.' His interviews are thus described by one of his clergy : 'He was never in a hurry, but he never wasted a moment. If a question were submitted to him which really required discussion, he would talk it over as deliberately as though he had nothing else to do that morning. But if a question were asked to which a reply could be given in a word, the word was spoken, and, with a pleasant smile, the interview was immediately ended. If a request could not be granted, he would go out of his way to show why, and, by thus taking the applicant into his confidence, almost as if he were asking his sympathy, he took the sting out of the refusal. Whether the interview lasted one minute or twenty, whether the application were granted or declined, the man went away feeling that he had gained a friend.'

The tiresome and often trivial questions which were submitted to him were a severe trial to his patience, but his irritation was well disguised, though it was a satisfaction to let it out sometimes. A friend met him once at the door showing out a deputation of discontented parishioners, and as he turned back with him, the Bishop replied to the

question how he was : ' As well as can be expected when every ass in the diocese thinks that he has a right to come and bray in my study.'

Thursday was always spent at the Ecclesiastical Commission. It had long been the custom for the Bishop of London to undertake to attend the Commission regularly. This Dr. Creighton found a task of living interest, as it brought before him many questions of far-reaching importance, different in kind from his usual routine. The real business of the Commission is transacted by a small inner body called the Estates Committee. At the close of the first meeting which he attended, the Bishop expressed his surprise at the great variety of the business, and said that he had been deeply interested. The work was all the more satisfactory to him because it brought him into close connexion with a man whom he delighted to praise, and whom he considered one of the ablest public servants in the country, Sir Alfred de Bock Porter, the permanent secretary of the Commission. At these meetings the Bishop found scope for his business capacities. One of his fellow-commissioners says that ' when present he was invariably the ruling spirit, and yet never seemed to dominate in a way which could offend, for his criticisms, though trenchant, were never bitter.' Sir Alfred de Bock Porter says : ' In difficult cases his assistance was invaluable, he seemed to see instinctively the crucial point at a glance, and with great fertility of resource he was always ready to formulate in happy phrases an expression of opinion which, while fairly meeting the case, would at the same time have the effect of discouraging further controversy.'

The Bishop was an ex-officio Trustee of the British Museum, and of the Natural History Museum, and was elected a Trustee of the National Portrait Gallery. He attended the meetings of these bodies whenever he could, and much enjoyed them, both on account of the distinguished men with whom he was associated and the interest of the business transacted. He often came home enthusiastic over the treasures he had seen at the Museum. He writes to a friend January 8, 1878 :

' I am writing this at a meeting. I am a Trustee of the

British Museum and am now sitting in that capacity. It is interesting work : one sees all the new things that come in. We are just talking of an old lady who brought a book which she offered for sale for 17*l*. It was found to contain seven tracts printed by Caxton, and she was paid 2,600*l*. Lucky old lady to come to honest persons.'

He had never loved London, and he much missed the visits to quiet country villages and the inspection of lovely old parish churches, which had brightened his work in his former diocese. It was a joy when he sometimes came upon a quiet place :

To his niece Winifred

‘ February 18, 1897.

‘ Yesterday I went out to a country parish to consecrate a burial-ground. I was quite delighted to find that there were one or two country villages left in my diocese. It was by the river and was quite quiet and rural.’

On a free afternoon at Fulham he liked to walk on Wimbledon Common, and soon discovered all the secrets of its varied beauty. When possible he took part in the hockey played twice a week in the field at Fulham by his children and their friends. From London House he took long walks about the parks and on the embankment, or rambled in obscure parts of the city. As a rule there was little time for recreation or exercise and in letters to his nieces and nephews he remarks again and again : ‘ I scarcely ever get a walk now.’ ‘ I have not had a walk for ages, and the joys of the spring are invisible to me.’ In odd moments he paced round and round the garden at Fulham with any companion he could find. He writes : ‘ My joy is to see the garden growing green and the sun shining upon it.’ He watched with sympathetic interest every effort to improve the garden, and was specially proud of the rare trees with which his predecessors, beginning with Bishop Compton, had adorned it. He liked to point them out to his visitors, and ordered labels with their names to be affixed to them. He also assisted in choosing at Kew some new varieties to add to the collection.

It was a real distress to him that circumstances made it difficult to have such friendly intercourse with his clergy in London as at Peterborough.

To Lady Grey

‘ June 1, 1897.

‘ Alas, the mention of quietness sends a pang through me. It has departed for ever from my life. Quietness had departed before, but now unrest has taken its place in the most acute form. I shall soon cease to have any intellect at all. I never have time to read a serious book, or take in new ideas. I am always talking, writing business letters, deciding questions, and being interviewed. Then the horror of it is that all my business is so inhuman. In my last diocese I had to go by train and after any service I had to spend a night or wait for a train. Now I drive to a place ten minutes before the time : sometimes I ask what I have come to do : the moment it is done, I drive off to the next place. I never see anyone as a human being, it is all business. I never see any children, which is a great pang to me. I never see young people. I have no joys left.

‘ So if you sometimes wrote to me, it would be a real act of charity. You cannot think how the sight of a letter which is not business cheers me.’

To a friend

‘ November 16, 1897.

‘ The great nuisance of London is one never sees anybody intimately. I am always going from place to place, seeing new people, and only seeing them on the outside. One never knows anybody till one knows them at home, and I rarely see anyone’s home. It is a matter of going to a church or a meeting, and then driving off again.’

He often lamented that he saw so few children in London, and if by any chance he had lunch or tea at a vicarage where there were children, it was a real refreshment.

It was impossible to know the curates in the diocese as he would have liked. Writing to some young clergy, who had left the diocese of Peterborough for Australia, he said :

‘ March 17, 1898.

‘ I was amused . . . to see how the American and Colonial bishops were bewildered at the sight of the mass of business which falls on the Bishop of London. It is immensely more than Peterborough in every way. I have four ordinations in the year and the numbers run from thirty to eighty at each. I never seem to be free from interviewing candidates. Confirmations go on steadily from February to July and are almost always in the evening. . . . My time is spent in meetings of every sort. It is a very inhuman life. I do not see

nearly so much of the clergy individually; and with 1,200 curates, constantly changing, I can see very little of them. But I must not write to you of my own misfortunes. I have to do my best and stagger on somehow: but London is a very difficult place.'

To his niece Winifred

'February 7, 1897.

'I wish you knew the difficulties I feel in giving decisions about matters which I do not know; that is the nuisance of a new beginning. However, I have had a tolerably peaceful day to-day and have learned something.'

'February 18, 1897.

'I can't tell you yet what I think of London, or how I shall get on. I think it is time for me to be a failure for a few years and perhaps for ever. Who knows? My job is anyhow very hard. I feel it very gritty.'

He used any opportunities of a talk with the older and more experienced clergy to draw from them what they knew about the diocese, and missed the close neighbourhood of the Cathedral body which at Peterborough had supplied him with advisers near at hand. He was glad when business took him to St. Paul's and he could have a talk with one of the canons or enjoy the hospitable welcome of the deanery.

At first, at any rate, overwhelming though the work was, he was stimulated by its variety and interest.

To his niece Winifred

'February 18.

'I feel as if people in London were very attentive and take up anything you say.'

'March 4, 1897.

'There is no one I now meet to be kind to me. It is all business, and I never see any young folk, only elderly gentlemen. . . . On Friday I had a good sample day. I left home at 10.30, had a Confirmation at 11. Then I went to Paddington, caught a special train, and at 1.10 went to Windsor with the Duke of Devonshire, Lord James of Hereford, and Lord Balfour of Burleigh; had lunch, and then took oaths as a member of the Privy Council; got back to Paddington at 4.30, went to Liverpool Street, and took train to Lower Edmonton; had a little dinner, and then a service at 7.30; got home about 11. This is the sort of way in which my days are spent. Do you think it is interesting? In many ways it is. One sees a good deal going on and the business is much more important than it was at Peterborough.'

‘April 9, 1897.

‘I never see anyone except on business, and that seems to be incessant. My head is always full of it. Of course I go to all sorts of places, and meet all sorts of people. It is amusing in a way : but I think there is too much of it. . . . Last night I went to dine at Toynbee Hall, and then talked to an assembly of Trade Unionists and Socialists about education : and then we had a discussion. . . . I never scarcely have time to read anything and seldom to write. Do not think I am grumbling. Everybody is very kind, and I am trying to get them all to go my way gently.’

He describes his life as ‘going from one thing to another, looking every morning to see what is the first thing to go to : and then setting out with a lot of papers to read by the way, and gain some notion what one ought to do or say.’ Amidst all the mass of business he welcomed anything that brought him in touch with individual souls.

To Mrs. Howard Pease

‘April 29, 1897.

‘It requires all my efforts to remain human in this inhuman spot, with all the business I have to do—business which is done in a rush and which depends solely on judgment, and rarely calls for any personal touch. The only things that cheer me are the letters that I get from folk in my diocese submitting their difficulties, small and personal ; sometimes, a young man’s trouble how to be honest in business, a soldier’s love-story and its difficulties ; such things I get, and they bring me back to human life.’

To Lady Grey

‘August 12, 1897.

‘Sometimes there come things human from unknown persons, strange questions of a most personal and intimate kind, which give one an awful sense of responsibility in answering.’

To his niece Winifred

‘October 28, 1897.

‘There is plenty of human nature in London. I seem lately to have had all sorts of little troubles referred to me. It is very hard to be strictly just in such matters. Yet without strict justice one can do nothing.’

The world which he defined as ‘the activities of this life with God left out’ seemed to him to invade everything in London, even the Church, tempting some of the clergy to aim at success and popularity, and become absorbed in efforts

to gather large congregations around them by competing in attractions with neighbouring churches.

To Mrs. Howard Pease

' March 17, 1898.

' We have moved to London House till Easter. It makes my work easier for me, as I have not so much travelling. It also brings me more visitors and makes me feel more in the world. But oh! how much world there is! The devil and the flesh are not nearly so dangerous combined. The trial of a bishop is that he is always engaged in outside matters. I really rejoice in Confirmations, which bring me into contact with the young. I do not find so many human beings in London as there were at Peterborough.'

To Miss Constance Barrett

' March 24, 1898.

' I am perpetually overwhelmed with work. I have to express more opinions than I have time to verify. I am in the very centre of all that is worldly. I am exposed to all the most deteriorating influences. All that I can do is to realise these facts, and try to possess my soul as well as I can.'

If the Church was to be strong in London, he felt that the Bishop must be known not only by the clergy but by the laity, and therefore that he must not only know London, but London must know him. His varied gifts opened to him many kinds of activity. One of his first public appearances in his new diocese was at the Royal Institution on February 5, when he spoke on 'the Picturesque in History'¹ to a crowded and delighted audience. The lecture abounded in characteristic sayings :

' A man's character is more revealed by what he tries to do than by what he succeeds in doing.'

' His most fruitful heritage is, generally speaking, his temper, his attitude towards life, his method of facing its problems.'

' A crisis is due to blundering and incapacity. But when a crisis occurs it is a revelation of character.'

' One of the great lessons of history is to show the bondage as well as the responsibility of power.'

' The great object of history is to trace the continuity of national life, and to discover and estimate the ideas on which that life is founded.'

¹ Published in *Lectures and Addresses*.

During the first six months of his episcopate, besides speaking at innumerable meetings about every kind of church work, he addressed the annual gathering of the London University Extension Students at the Mansion House on 'The Story of a Country.'¹ He spoke at meetings on Early Closing, Vigilance Work and Public Health. He discussed educational questions with members of the Toynbee Hall working men clubs; he spoke at the London School of Economics, then just getting into working order under the able guidance of his friends Mr. and Mrs. Sidney Webb; he lectured at Salisbury on 'the Coming of Augustine,' and spoke to the London Church Reading Union on 'the Advantage of Consecutive Reading.'² He was a guest at many public dinners, where he was invariably called upon to speak, on occasions so various as the gathering of old Cumbrians at the dinner of the Cumberland Benevolent Society, the farewell dinner to Mr. Bayard, the American Ambassador, the dinner of the Architectural Association, of the Artists' Benevolent Society, of the contributors to the Dictionary of National Biography. At the dinner given in commemoration of the Jubilee by one hundred distinguished women, who each invited one man, he was the chosen guest of Mrs. Sidney Webb, and the only speaker except Mrs. Steel, the originator of the dinner, and Lady Henry Somerset. He concluded his speech by saying :

'Could we distract our minds from our companions and look on each other's faces, we should perceive a deep sense of unworthiness, each man inly wondering how the other man came to be asked. . . . When our best books are mocked at, our finest oratory unappreciated, and we are in gloom and depression, a vision of this evening will rise before us, and we shall be cheered by remembering that once on a time, one lady thought us sufficiently distinguished to invite us to be her guest. Then we shall repose in peace upon the recollection.'

His after-dinner speaking was much appreciated; the playful irony which often veiled real and suggestive thought, the unexpected turns of speech, the invariable anecdote up to

¹ Published in *Lectures and Addresses*.

² Published in *Thoughts on Education*.

which he liked to lead, the bantering humour, always kept his audience amused and attentive, and undue length never tried their patience. It was a delight to sit by Dr. Temple at the Mansion House dinner to the Bishops, and watch his face whilst Dr. Creighton was speaking, and then hear his delighted chuckle 'He's too clever.'

There were private as well as public dinners; old and new friends joined in welcoming him to London. To quote from others:

'The stir and movement of his presence made itself felt at once and felt everywhere. London, so slow to perceive what is happening in the midst of it, could not but be aware of this new arrival. He proved that even this huge, unwieldy sluggish mass of a diocese could actually feel the impact, from end to end, of a vivid personal inspiration.'¹

'What the diocese wanted when Dr. Creighton took it over, was a visible chief. London wanted a bishop who would speak for it and to it as a whole—a leader who would surmount details, seize on its imagination, and touch it on every side of its multitudinous life. This part the new Bishop set himself to play. Hence his incessant appearances in public, on platforms, at meetings and banquets; his plunge into the vortex of London society.'²

'When he came to London, he mixed freely in various sorts of society, for none came amiss to him, and he was just the same to them all. He was the reverse of dazzled, and used to complain that the average intelligence of Londoners was so low.'³

'He spiced life for us all' was another comment. The newspapers were full of him, sometimes reporting his sayings with warm approval, at other times indignantly contradicting his paradoxes.

His faculty for remembering names and faces helped him to feel at home in his new surroundings, whilst his constant public appearances soon made him a familiar figure, and he was drawn and caricatured under many circumstances. He was indifferent to the criticisms of the press, and was amused at the irritation expressed because he was supposed to have spoken slightly of newspapers, and to have said

¹ Sermon at St. Paul's Cathedral, January 20, 1901, by Canon Scott Holland.

² Article in the *Quarterly Review*, April 1901.

³ Article by Herbert Paul, *Nineteenth Century*, July 1901.

that he never read them. This remark was constantly brought up against him. As a matter of fact, he gave only the interval between prayers and breakfast to reading the 'Times,' ten minutes was as a rule enough, and yet he seemed to know everything in the paper and to have grasped the characteristics of all the leading public men. In the evening he glanced at the 'Westminster Gazette,' and always read 'Punch' with great thoroughness. The 'Guardian' was the only other weekly paper he looked at. He knew how to pick up a great deal of what was going on from others.

He had been elected member of several well-known dining clubs, 'The Club,' Grillions, and 'Nobody's Friends,' and much enjoyed attending their dinners and talking with the distinguished men whom he met there. For many years he had been a member of the Athenæum, having been elected (under rule 2) in 1886; he was an original member of the Savile.

He liked to entertain all manner of men, and it was partly in order to be able to give dinners which public men could attend, that he resided in London during the early part of the season. In the summer we had Saturday to Monday parties at Fulham, and he persuaded his London friends to look upon a visit there as a visit into the country. He might have to go and preach in London, but his guests could forget that London was within reach, and spend long lazy afternoons of talk under the trees. He tried to be at home on Sunday afternoons, and it was then that his more intimate friends could enjoy his society, round the tea table in the great hall in winter, in the garden in summer, or else pacing up and down the lawn in talk, sometimes gay, sometimes serious.

'To his friends,' writes one of them, 'the Bishop was more than kind; he was sympathetic, warm-hearted and affectionate. And he was always the same. Whatever worries he might have in his diocese, he did not inflict them, or the depression they must have caused, upon his guests. He liked to talk about something else, and what was there he could not talk about? . . . He certainly talked a lot of nonsense with children . . . he did not grow old, or even middle-aged himself. One always thought of him as a young man, and put down his occasional freaks to the exuberance of youth.'¹

¹ Herbert Paul in the *Nineteenth Century*, July 1901.

In general society he never talked shop, and no one found it easy to pick his brains about ecclesiastical politics. He would talk about people, always interested in trying to understand motive and character ; about books, he was fond of discussing the problems raised by the last novel he had read ; about politics, but rather about the ideas that lay behind them than about the current questions of party politics. Even some who knew him well felt it difficult to get at his political opinions. 'He was far more interested in ascertaining other people's opinions than in getting them to adopt his own.' His mind moved in such a different sphere of ideas from the minds of those who were engaged in practical politics, that they sometimes felt as if their particular problems had no interest for him. He was concerned with great principles, with the origins and the tendencies of the great movements of thought, and he often remarked that it was difficult to get people to be interested in ideas. He loved either to hear or tell a good story, but above all he made people talk to him about themselves. 'And how have you been getting on? Come and tell me all about yourself,' was his common greeting to a friend.

At Convocation times the house was filled with bishops and other Church dignitaries, and clergy from his old diocese were often invited. As far as possible he entertained the London clergy, and never liked to have a dinner party without some representatives of them. Of course they were all invited to the great garden parties which have been the rule at Fulham since the days of Bishop Tait. These parties reached such huge proportions, numbering on fine days over four thousand guests, that it was hardly possible for the Bishop to do more than greet each individually. But very many of those who passed before him on these occasions in never-ending stream were recognised and greeted with an appropriate remark. The children, who came in large numbers, received a specially warm welcome.

Hardly a week passed without a gathering of some sort at Fulham ; there were garden meetings in summer, meetings in the great hall in winter, always followed by tea, excursions of many different societies, such as the Toynbee Travellers' Club and various temperance bodies.

When in 1897 some Protestant association presided over by Mr. Kensit asked to come and see Fulham, they were entertained like anyone else. Every summer a certain number of mothers' meetings from poor parishes were invited to enjoy an afternoon in the garden; his desire was to make Fulham of use to the whole diocese.

He wished to be in close touch with those of his brother bishops who shared with him the spiritual care of London, and every two months spent an evening with the Bishops of Rochester and St. Albans that they might talk over their common problems. The Bishop of Rochester (Dr. Talbot) was an old friend of far-off Oxford days; the Bishop of St. Albans (Dr. Festing) he had learnt to love and esteem at the meetings of the East Anglian bishops. The Bishop of Rochester says that 'Creighton always seemed in their talks to be more occupied with the general bearings of things, with the real issues, than with any practical steps to be taken; his utterances were a little "cryptic." It seemed as if he used these meetings to help him to think out things, and see how they looked in the eyes of others, and that he felt that, if once he could see a thing in its proper bearings, the action to be taken in any particular case would disclose itself as the need arose.'

Under normal circumstances, the work of the diocese of London must be overwhelming, but the Bishop never had to do with his diocese under normal circumstances. In his first year the Jubilee of Queen Victoria and the meeting of the Pan-Anglican Conference added enormously to his work. He was hardly settled in London before he was called upon to take part in the organisation of the Prince of Wales' Hospital Fund, and in various arrangements for the Jubilee.

One of the first public acts with which he was concerned was particularly agreeable to him on account of his sense of the claims both of historical justice and of international courtesy. An application was made to him by the United States ambassador that the manuscript known as the 'Log of the Mayflower,' which was in the library at Fulham Palace, should be restored to the American people, and given to the custody of the American ambassador. The manuscript contained not only the diary of William Bradford, afterwards

governor of New Plymouth, with an account of the fortunes of the pilgrim fathers, but also an authentic register of the births, deaths, and marriages of the colonists of New England from 1620-1650. The Bishop was anxious to find a means of acceding to the request of the Ambassador. He wrote to Lord Salisbury, sending him the application, and said :

‘ January 29, 1897.

‘ I have further had an interview with Mr. Bayard, in which I explained to him that I could take no practical step without your lordship’s sanction.

‘ As far as my personal opinion is concerned, I am in favour of restoring the MS. to the country whence it came. In the interests of study, it is well that documents should be in the place to which they refer. Their restoration is an occasion for international courtesy. I would further add that the library at Fulham contains nothing else that is of importance. It is not, therefore, in the position of a large collection which is being deprived of a cherished possession.

‘ I have spoken to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and he is of the same opinion as myself.

‘ Before, however, I give any answer to the request, I would submit the matter to your lordship to decide *if* it should be done, and *how* it can be done.’

In reply to some inquiries made by Lord Salisbury, he wrote again :

‘ Fulham Palace : February 13, 1897.

‘ My dear Lord Salisbury,—In reference to the manuscript history of Massachusetts, which it is proposed to restore to the United States, I have made further inquiry from the Archbishop of Canterbury and have further searched into the history of the Fulham Palace library.

‘ It consists of books of various kinds left by former occupants of the See. The only bishop who seems to have made any formal bequest was Bishop Porteus, who died in 1808, and bequeathed his books by will, together with a sum of money for the building of a library.

‘ What is apparently the catalogue of his books remains in the library in manuscript. It contains no mention of the manuscript now in question, nor is there any record of the manner in which it came into the possession of the Bishop of London.

‘ It seems most probable that the manuscript at the time of the outbreak of hostilities in Boston, was in the hands of someone who brought it to England, and deposited it with

the Bishop of London, as ordinary of foreign and colonial chaplains.'

The difficulty was to discover how an individual bishop of London could be authorised to give up a valuable manuscript in his official library. The Bishop consulted his chancellor, who decided first that as the document contained a register of marriages, births and deaths, it ought to be kept in the registry of the chancellor of the diocese. It was therefore given into the chancellor's keeping, who then held a consistory court, at which he made a formal order to hand over 'The Log of the Mayflower' to Mr. Bayard, to be transmitted by him to the Governor of Massachusetts, on condition that photographic fac-similes of the manuscript should be given to the chancellor's registry and to the Fulham library.

The Bishop handed over the manuscript to Mr. Bayard on April 30; and the following week attended as a specially honoured guest the farewell dinner given by the American Society in London to Mr. Bayard, when the 'Log of the Mayflower' was exhibited. Mr. Bayard on his return to America delivered the precious volume to the Governor of Massachusetts in the presence of the two Houses of the Legislature of the State, and of a large number of officials and notable citizens. He wrote to the Bishop 'such incidents obliterate the memories of ancient feuds and ignorant prejudices, and bring the hearts of the kindred nations into sympathetic and normal relations.' To commemorate the incident both the Archbishop and the Bishop were made members of the American Antiquarian Society.

The other papers at Fulham illustrating the past history of the see, and especially the early history of the Church in America, which had been under the jurisdiction of the Bishops of London, were found by the Bishop to be in a condition of great dirt and disorder. Under his direction they were sorted and dusted and arranged as conveniently as possible for reference in a room set apart for the purpose. But time was not allowed for the full cataloguing and ordering of these papers which had been desired.

On March 30 he spoke for the first time in the House of Lords, on the second reading of the Voluntary Schools Act.

He urged that those who were always ready to speak of the nonconformist conscience should remember 'that the Church of England had also a right to possess a conscience.' He said :

'The advocates of the voluntary system are convinced that in maintaining that system they are maintaining principles which are essential for the maintenance of education itself. . . . If religious education is to be genuine it must be denominational, and have a definite point of attachment to the life and character of the child who is being taught. . . . The suppression of voluntary schools by the brute force of financial pressure would leave behind it an inextinguishable sense of wrong, and would produce results most dangerous to the well being of society. . . . Neither I nor any of my brethren wish for any arrangement that will not be satisfactory or just to all concerned. It is a matter of deep regret to us that there should be even the appearance of injustice towards anybody whatever in our just claim to teach those things of which we are profoundly convinced.'

In conclusion, he claimed that those who supported the bill were 'animated by a nobler conception of the nature of education, and a higher ideal of civil and religious liberty, than was displayed by their opponents.'

His speech was very well received. It was described as 'graceful, full of culture, and excellently delivered, perhaps the best and freshest second reading speech made on the bill in either House.'

To his niece Ella

'April 1, 1897.

'My principal experience since I wrote last has been that of making a speech in the House of Lords. It is about the most awful thing you can do. As a rule nobody listens, but they all talk to one another. There is no applause except that when you sit down one or two people say "Hear, hear." However I made my speech late on, and was followed by Lord Kimberley, who could not find any hole to pick in me. I believe my speech was thought a success; but it is very nervous work making a maiden speech, as you are not sure of the sort of tone to adopt, and do not wish to seem cheeky.

'As a rule I leave home about 10 in the morning, and return about 10 or 11 at night; sometimes in the interval I collapse into my club and a novel; but this is rare.

'Cuthbert and Walter have amused themselves by offering their services to the Cambridge settlement during their

vacation. They spent last night in a boys' club at Camberwell, playing cards and such like things with some forty little ragamuffins. They enjoyed it very much. I do not think people know how really amusing the London boys are, and, indeed, the people generally. I find my work full of interest and always new. You see there is so much more than can possibly be done, that I have a choice what I will do.'

On Easter Monday we went to spend a few days with the Humphry Wards, who had taken Levens Hall for the spring.

To Miss Gertrude Ward at Magila

'Levens Hall: April 22, 1897.

'My dear Gertrude,—I have been meaning to write to you for a long time, but my work has been so incessant since I went to London that the duties of friendship have been forgotten. Even to a bishop, Easter brings a certain repose, and on Monday with a joyful mind I came off here for a few days' holiday, which I am using in discharging neglected obligations. It is a lovely place, so old and quaint, and with such charming surroundings that I forget all my woes and ramble as of yore with Dorothy on the hills. There are no clergy to interview me; I asked my chaplain to intercept letters, and only send me those which were absolutely necessary. So peace prevails. A bishop of London has more to do than can be done. I must organise my possible activities some day. But this year the Lambeth Conference and the Jubilee, and my novelty to the work, make a fearful pressure.

'Everybody here is very flourishing. Mary¹ is particularly well and gets on with her new book. . . . Sometimes it rains, sometimes the sun shines; the larches are turning green, and all looks bright even when it rains. There is a sense of idyllic charm. Humphry is just going back to work in London. I have two days more. The world wags on with us even as it does with you. The family grow older, and one wonders what they are all going to do. But time alone can show.

'Of course I find London immensely interesting. Everywhere there is abundant life, which raises the question—Where is it going? But there is a great loss of the personal touch in everything one does. People are busy, seen only for a few moments; business and business only; decisions given without full explanations of the grounds. So much time is taken up with pure administration that little is left for any other

¹ Mrs. T. H. Ward.

purpose. Party spirit is strong and antagonisms are hard to overcome. I have a general sense that everybody is trying to exploit me, and if I do not do just what they want, are prepared to abuse me. I feel it necessary to screw my head on tight and go my own way gently. These are my first impressions.

‘Of course London absorbs Louise as well as myself. She is given to meetings and committees. I sometimes wonder why we do not each of us improve ourselves, instead of holding perpetual meetings to improve one another. But I suppose it would be more difficult and less generally satisfactory.’

To his niece Ella

‘April 29, 1897.

‘I had an interesting thing to do yesterday, to “profess” seven novices in a sisterhood. It was in their own chapel and was very impressive, and I liked them all very much. They nurse and keep a hospital on their premises, and three of their patients were presently wheeled into the chapel to be confirmed. It had a curious effect, three litters with people clad in white suddenly appearing among the black-robed sisters. Then I had to dine at a public dinner at Fulham; it was severe, but one must show oneself in one’s own neighbourhood. This morning I have been settling all about the Jubilee with the Prince of Wales, who was very cheery and enjoys a granddaughter.

‘Now I have more to do than can be done. I am just going to interview the American ambassador. Then I have a sermon to preach, and then I have some people to dinner to talk business.’

‘May 13, 1897.

‘I do not find that I grow less busy. Last week I had a Diocesan Conference, and on Friday went to a great dinner in honour of Mr. Bayard, the American minister, who was departing. Then on Saturday I went to the Crystal Palace to a display of Bands of Hope, who marched past the Duke of Cambridge, whom I had to take care of. In the evening I was in the chair at a dinner, and had to make speeches about art. On Sunday I went to Kew to preach, and lunched with the Duke of Cambridge; thence to Islington, where I visited the Church Missionary College, and preached to the students. But why go on with this catalogue? It represents my ordinary life. This week we have a houseful of bishops who are at Convocation, and to-night a dinner party of twenty. There is no peace or quietness.’

The Bishop met his diocesan conference for the first time on May 6, at King's College. His presidential address,¹ was devoted chiefly to a consideration of the education question. He said that the difficulties in discussing the matter arose 'from the fact that we have constructed an education problem which has been concerned with every possible topic but education,' and that the 'settlement of our educational difficulties will come just in proportion as we set the children before us as the class who are really concerned. He expressed his opinion that 'the way by which we shall get rid of many of our old controversies and emerge into a larger and serener atmosphere is by having a more widely spread interest in education as such.' He seemed to foresee the Education Bills of 1902 and 1903 when he said, 'It is always hazardous to attempt to forecast the future, but I certainly conceive that the question of secondary education should call into being a central educational authority, on which there should be a proper representation of educational experts . . . under this central council there should be local authorities. I am certain that we shall make no progress in education unless we have local educational authorities.' It would be difficult to know how to deal with the school boards, because 'we have got into a position in which it seemed to be considered sacrilegious to touch the school boards.' But his speech was full of hope that the whole question might be lifted into a purer air, and that if we could only free ourselves from the dust of past controversies, a wiser educational policy might emerge.

Much time was taken in arranging details in connexion with the thanksgiving service to be held on the steps of St. Paul's on the Jubilee day. The idea of this service had in the first place been the Bishop's, but it was warmly taken up by everyone concerned. Some mistaken notions having arisen concerning it, the Bishop departed from his invariable custom of never writing to the newspapers, and wrote to the 'Times' to explain that it was misleading to speak as if Her Majesty's purpose on her drive on Jubilee day was to attend an open-air service at St. Paul's Cathedral. 'The singing of the Te Deum is merely

¹ Published in *The Church and the Nation*, p. 216.

a beautiful and appropriate incident in the day's proceedings. It is a reminiscence of the services held throughout England on the previous Sunday, not a substitute for them. It has no claim to be a complete or adequate expression of religious feeling at such a time. This will have been made before.'

The space on the steps of St. Paul's is limited, and the number of people anxious to be present was very large. The Prince of Wales was specially desirous that representatives of the various religious bodies should be stationed there, and the Bishop exerted himself to see that his wishes were carried out, and to have invitations issued in such a way as to hurt the susceptibilities of as few people as possible.

Many had desired that a representative of the Russian Church should attend the Jubilee, and after some negotiations the Bishop was able to announce through the 'Times' that Lord Salisbury had received a despatch from Her Majesty's ambassador at S. Petersburg, in which his excellency reports that 'Monseigneur Antonius, Archbishop of Finland, has been deputed by the Holy Synod to attend the Jubilee of the sixtieth anniversary of the Queen's accession to the throne.'

The Russian Archbishop was invited to stay at Fulham, and arrived on Thursday, May 17, accompanied by an interpreter and General Keréief, a charming and cultivated man, who spoke English perfectly. The Archbishop was a distinguished-looking man and a very agreeable guest. He spoke only Russian, and all conversation had to be carried on by means of an interpreter. But he entered most charmingly into our home life—our family party had been increased by the Bishop's nephews and nieces, who came up to London for the Jubilee—and interested himself in all our young people. He was a central figure at our garden parties, in his long flowing robes with his tall hat and veil falling behind. Many Russians came to see him, and Mr. Birkbeck took him to visit various English churches and clergy, and to the universities to receive hon. degrees.

Sunday, June 20, was the day appointed by the Queen for solemn services of thanksgiving for the mercies of her reign. The Bishop preached at the service at St. Paul's

¹ Archbishop Antonius has since become Metropolitan of Russia.

Cathedral, which was attended by the Prince and Princess of Wales, and other members of the royal family, by the members of the Government, the ambassadors, the colonial premiers, and representatives of every class of the nation. The Archbishop of Finland came in a splendid purple cope, his train borne by two attendants in tunics of white damask silk and cloth of gold, bearing in his hand an ancient crozier set with jewels.

The Bishop's sermon, which could be heard in every part of the densely crowded building, lifted the thoughts of all to discern the real meaning of the occasion. He spoke of the necessity of gathering the lessons brought by a time of heightened national consciousness, by a great moment of exultation. He said that 'nations are strong in proportion as they have a clear conception of a national destiny ;' that 'no nation has continued great that has not had a growing consciousness of a universal mission, founded on a general belief in justice and righteousness, a burning passion to apply them first within her own limits, and then to carry them wherever her influence could reach.' He singled out 'as the great characteristic of the Victorian era, an awakened conscience about our duties to our fellows.' In his words about the Queen he expressed his own strong personal devotion. 'We honour our Queen as ruler was never honoured before, because we can look upon her, during all the long years of her eventful reign, as the unchanging and unwavering representative of this desire to moralise all human relationships, which is the flower of our civilisation. . . . We feel how much is due to her who, removed from the shocks of the conflict of opinions, yet keenly interested in everything that affected the country's welfare, has exercised a moderating influence with unfailing discretion. . . . She has taught Europe how a ruler can command the reverence and win the affection of a free people.' In conclusion he pointed out the lessons which the English people might learn from the example of the Queen, and bade them remember the steadfast discipline of character required for the duties of her high office. 'We need more of the spirit of discipline. It remains as the great undertaking before us to show how free men will bear the yoke of discipline, how they will learn the responsibility which attaches to opinions, how they

will readily contribute their separate wisdom to the common store.' From the Queen's example we might learn more sympathy with the aims and aspirations of other nations. 'Let us offer the fruits of our experience to other countries with greater humility and better understanding of their present position. . . . The time has come when we must labour to extend our influence by greater meekness, and must condition our frankness by the sympathy which is inculcated by the maxim "Honour all men."'¹

On the Jubilee day the Bishop stood by the side of the Archbishops on the steps of St. Paul's to welcome the Queen. His appearance was thus described in the 'Daily Chronicle':

'His cope was of a stuff which more than taxes possibility of description,² and just as he came out the first glimpse of sunshine fell upon him, and his keen intellectual, kindly and firm face seemed to light up as though he had had in some far-away past a dream of pontifical pomp of which this was in part a realisation. Upon his head he wore a skull-cap of pure cloth of gold, and it pivoted the eyes of all who looked on as the sun caught it, and dashed back its reflection in the eyes of thousands.'

After the 'Te Deum' had been sung the Bishop said the Jubilee Prayer 'with that clear musical voice of his which seemed to penetrate the great gathering.' At the end of the brief ceremony the Queen motioned to him to come forward, and expressed her satisfaction with the arrangements.

To Lady Grey

'The Jubilee was a tremendous labour in many ways. The Queen said to me that it was a beautiful service, and she had enjoyed it very much: she asked me to thank all concerned. The Prince of Wales wrote me a letter next day to say that he had never seen anything better managed or more impressive, so that we were covered with glory.'

At the Queen's request he wrote for her an account of his impressions on this occasion.

¹ The sermon is published in *The Mind of St. Peter and other Sermons*.

² This cope was presented by the late Mr. Offley Wakeman. It was made of the silk that had been woven for the coronation robe of the Empress Frederic, and is the only piece of that particular brocade in existence. It now belongs to the diocese, and is worn by the present bishop.

Various functions connected with the Jubilee followed in quick succession, ending with a dinner given by Mr. Chamberlain to meet the Colonial Premiers, and amidst all these public functions time had to be found for confirmations and meetings and the ordinary routine of work. On July 1, the Pan-Anglican Conference met. It had been fixed for this year, partly to enable the colonial bishops to be also present at the Jubilee, and partly that the representatives of the Anglican communion might meet together on the 1300th anniversary of the coming of St. Augustine. During July, successive parties of American and colonial bishops, many of them with their wives and daughters, stayed at Fulham.

To Lady Grey

‘August 12.

‘For the entire month of July we were engaged in entertaining relays of American and other bishops. It was very interesting. It increased one’s knowledge of geography and of imperial problems. It was also interesting to see how religion affects nationality—I mean in the case of the American bishops. Anglicanism gave them a way of looking at things which went farther than they thought. They were very good fellows, full of fun, and with a breezy way of looking at the world which was useful to contemplate. Hopefulness is a characteristic of new countries as of young people, and we ought to profit by it.’

The sessions of the Lambeth Conference continued throughout July; the Bishop, though present, took no prominent part in them, but he was always ready to work, and allowed himself to be put on several committees. At the luncheon which marked the close of the conference, he proposed the health of the American bishops, and spoke of the intimacy with them which had been promoted by the conference, and of the sense of unity and brotherhood which had grown up. He said ‘that the conference would have been infinitely poor if it had not been for the presence of their brethren from the United States . . . not only did they introduce into the discussions a somewhat different element, but they enlivened the private talks afterwards with the humour peculiar to themselves.’ He concluded by dwelling on the permanent gain it would be to have felt that ‘our Church remains the same when it takes its existence among a perfectly inde-

pendent people. We feel in that a guarantee of its reality, of the fundamental strength of its position, and we feel sure that the great distinctive mark of the Anglican Church throughout the world is that it is the Church, and represents the ecclesiastical organisation, which is suitable to the life of free men.'

The next day he was one of a great number of bishops and others who, on the invitation of the Bishop of Bath and Wells, made a pilgrimage to Glastonbury Abbey, the spot claimed by tradition as the earliest Christian site in England. 'Never, probably, since the Reformation,' he said, 'had such a procession taken place in England as the long band of bishops, clergy, choristers, and civic dignitaries, who, singing, and carrying banners, made their way across the sunny lawns to the grey ruins of the famous Abbey.'

On August 7 he started for his holiday. Already on July 19 he had written to his niece: 'I am now looking forward eagerly for the beginning of the holidays, I never looked forward to anything so much. . . . I am slowly beginning to end up my work, but this is difficult. I must get away and leave things to settle themselves.' Part of his holidays he wished to spend with his children and nephews and nieces, and we went, a large family party, to a house on the banks of Ulleswater:

To Lady Grey

'Glenridding House: August 12, 1897.

'You . . . are exploring the joys of quiet reading and meditation. They have a great charm of their own: perhaps I look upon them with exaggerated fondness because I am never likely to enjoy them. I have the melancholy feeling that I am now quite played out. I must go on as I am till I fizzle away. There is no change possible. However, there is one advantage of London life: it makes the joy of country quiet more intense than I should have thought possible. We came here on Saturday night, the whole family of us, and found here four of my nephews and nieces. Think of eleven rampant young persons and tremble. Two days spent on the hills made me ten years younger. Then came rain, which has enabled me to write letters. . . . I am now trying in peace and quietness to devise some means of not being always engaged in London. It requires great deliberation to steel one's heart to say *no*. I am engaged

in meditating how to increase the class of things I will not do.'

He was not content till he had climbed every hill within reach. On wet days, and in the lake district they are many, he joined in romps and games of the maddest kind with his children. Sitting out watching the stars on fine evenings, or on long walks on the hill-sides, he would talk to them on every conceivable topic and draw them out to talk to him. He was playfellow, friend, and companion, as well as father, and specially tried in every way to make up to his nephews and nieces for the loss of their parents.

To Lady Grey

'Glenridding House : August 13, 1897.

'I grow more and more enchanted with this place. Rambling uphill just suits me. How much more beautiful England is than any other country, on account of its size. Here, for instance, in a day's walk you get every kind of mountain form and vegetation in two or three hours. In other lands you only get one impression a day; here you get a dozen. Size is no element in beauty, but versatility is. I am writing an essay on scenery : this must be repressed.'

On August 26, he and I started for North Italy. Letters had followed him to Ulleswater, but his chaplain had orders if possible to forward nothing to Italy. He gave himself up to the impressions of the moment and sought in close companionship with nature, new life for soul and body. We stopped first at Faido and then at Lugano.

To his niece Winifred

'September 10, 1897.

'What a lovely place Lugano is ! I am afraid it is more beautiful than Cumberland. It is grander, severer, more picturesque. Its lines are more commanding. The very fact that so many villages are dotted about the hills with their church towers makes it fuller of human interest. Cumberland is more intimate, though it looks wilder ; Italy is more suggestive and impressive, because it tells of man and nature together.'

To his son Cuthbert

'Lugano : September 4, 1897.

'Dearest Cuthbert,—We are getting on, and I think to-night the weather is going to be right. Hitherto it has been sultry and cloudy, and things have not looked

their best. But yesterday made a contribution towards a change. We had our experience of it. I think I will try to give you a detailed account. The morning looked doubtful, but at 11 we plucked up our courage and went to the station, travelled to a neighbouring place, and then struck up the hills. Only, the hills here are not at all like those of Cumberland, for you make for a village at once, generally by a path through chestnut woods. We found a lovely view, and went on to one village and then to another still higher, then above that lay a monastery. We made for that, and had a lovely view of lakes and mountains. It was then half past one, and we felt hungry. I rang the monastery bell, and in about five minutes a dirty ragamuffin appeared, who looked as if he had just got out of bed. I asked for some bread and cheese and wine. He mumbled something and retired. I thought he had gone to get it, but after waiting a quarter of an hour nothing appeared, and there was no sound of anything. So we shook off the dust against that monastery and descended to the nearest village: it looked hopelessly dirty. So we made for another. Then I caught a boy and asked him if I could get some wine. He led me through a narrow lane and to a house, and said that was an inn. I entered and found an old woman seated among the débris of innumerable cabbages, cutting them up with one hand and with the other nursing a child who was ill with bronchitis. The room had a wood fire, with a huge pot in which the cabbages were boiling. Cocks and hens were roaming all round, and a travelling pedlar was seated, sadly having a drink of wine. I preferred a humble request for some food, and the good woman said that this was not a luxurious hotel. I replied that it was among the best I had ever visited, and murmured bread and cheese. Cheese she thought was impossible, but suggested sausage. I assented, and she went out to buy one. On her departure the child screamed continuously and refused all comfort. Presently she returned triumphantly with a sausage, which she proceeded to cut into slices. Bread and knives followed. I asked for wine, but she insisted that I must have a bottle, not the common wine on draught. I agreed, and she descended into her cellar. She produced her bottle, and it certainly quenched one's thirst admirably. It was sparkling vinegar, so sharp that it took your breath away, and led you to wonder if you could ever drink again. We satisfied our ravening hunger, while the good lady proceeded to cut up apples and add them to the boiling pot. What the effect of cabbages and apples boiled

together might be I cannot say. I inquired what it was, and learned that its name was *maiale* ; but whether it was to be eaten by man or beast I was not quite sure. Presently she produced a dish of excellent peaches for us. Her charge for this repast was one and a half francs, of which one franc was for the wine. We parted with expressions of mutual gratitude. By this time it was three o'clock and we were nearly ten miles from Lugano. The clouds had gathered and it began to rain. I had a notion of going across the hills, but mother objected to forests in the rain. So we tried the road, which led by a pretty little lake. At the next village I asked for a short cut, and was shown a path which led at last through vineyards. Meanwhile the sky had grown very black, and it was clear that rain was really coming. In the middle of the fields the storm suddenly fell upon us, a mighty thunderstorm. The wind rose, the air was black, we were enveloped in thick fog, the lightning flashed with splendid forks close to me, so that I felt it warm my left cheek ; the thunder crashed as I never heard it crash before. In a moment we were wet to the skin, and every sign of a road had disappeared. The noise was such that we could not hear one another speak. There was nothing to do but to plunge on. Luckily we soon came to a road, but in the darkness took a wrong turning, which slightly lengthened our walk. In time we reached a village, where the streets were half a foot deep in water. There we found we were an hour from Lugano. We got there—to the opposite end from our hotel—and had to trudge on, as no cab or tram had dared to face the storm. Mother is bemoaning a ruined dress. Even the natives say that they have seldom seen such a storm. It was an amusing experience, but it would not do every day.'

We went next to stay with Count Balzani and his two little girls in a villa amongst the vineyards near Ivrea. It was a spot of rare beauty, with a view on one side up the Val d'Aosta into the mysterious depths of the great mountains, and on the other over the sunny plain of Lombardy. Here, wandering day after day amongst the lower slopes of the Alps, we watched the vintage and the ingathering of many kinds of fruit and grain.

A few days after his return to England, he visited Leicester to open the new Technical and Art Schools built by the Corporation. The memory of his mountain walks must have been

lingering in his mind when he said, in his speech at the public luncheon, 'Industry does not in itself immediately add to the beauty or the grace of the neighbourhood in which it is domiciled . . . We see in all the surroundings of our life the distinct loss of the element of beauty. The object of art teaching is . . . that we may have a great sense of beauty influencing the life of everyone.'

The same day he was presented with the oil paintings, which the citizens of Leicester had allowed him to choose for himself as a farewell present. In thanking for them he said :

'If as one grows older one measures one's life by the thought of the kindnesses one has received and the response one has met with from others, then these five years have been the most fruitful of my life. During the time I lived amongst you, I met with nothing but unfailing kindness on all hands ; and the longer I live, the more deeply I am convinced that the true and abiding qualities are not the intellectual qualities, but the qualities of absolute simplicity and straightforwardness and the desire for the right. . . . The task that I set before myself—no, it was not really a task because it was the easiest and the most obvious thing to do—was to go about amongst you saying, as simply and frankly as I could, what I thought upon any subject which was brought before me. If in so doing you feel I have been of any use, I can only express my sincere thankfulness, and thank you in return for the many kindnesses which you have shown me.'

It was the custom in London for the Bishop to attend and address a chapter and a conference of each of his rural deaneries in the autumn. This custom the Bishop kept up, but he did not follow his predecessor's plan of allowing the deaneries to elect their own rural deans. He preferred to choose them himself, as he regarded the rural dean as his representative in the deanery, not as the representative of the clergy.

This year the subject of his twenty-two addresses to the clergy was 'Undenominationalism.' These addresses were extempore, and no doubt varied a good deal on the different occasions. The following notes have been supplied by one of those who heard him :

'Undenominationalism may be a clumsy word, but it expresses the very common idea that it is possible to get hold

of the spirit of Christianity without being troubled by forms and dogma, and that it is a noble thing to rise above forms and dogma. . . . The causes leading to this attitude may be classified under three main heads.

‘(1) *Political causes.* In these days of fully developed democracy every man is a politician. The chief result of democracy has not been, as many imagine, a change of method in the management of national business, but an extension of interest in the conduct of national business throughout the whole nation. This has made the work of the politician harder. He knows that no one can have things arranged exactly as he would desire. To him the question always is “How can this particular matter be most conveniently settled?” He is constantly occupied in settling inconvenient questions, and he naturally wishes to do this in the easiest possible way. Any view which stands upon a principle is a hindrance to him. Religious principles in particular stiffen the human will so much, that the politician finds that the human stuff on which he has to work does not yield to him as easily as he would wish. The very existence of the Church is a trouble and annoyance to practical statesmen. We are a nuisance to them. We are as grit in the wheels of the machine which they are trying to turn. Still the politician wants the assistance of religion as far as it can help his purposes. But from that point of view he approaches it on its undogmatic side. He likes to appeal to those large principles of religion which assert the Fatherhood of God and the dignity of man. He wants from religion just as much as is needed for his purposes and no more.

‘(2) *Moral causes.* The awakened conscience of the present day has been directed towards great philanthropic aims . . . and philanthropy wants a simple straightforward sort of religion which will give it the force needed to carry out obvious improvements. Its sphere is limited. It may aim at doing good in a large way, but it often ends merely in such things as the provision of better water and drainage. But, as religiously minded men work to improve the conditions of their fellow-creatures, they are naturally led to feel a great horror of the many evils which result from the dissensions among Christian people. They express their sense of the unnaturalness of these evils by a desire for unity, which often shows itself in a way which does more credit to their general moral feelings than to their intellectual capacity to appreciate the issues involved in the differences between organised religious bodies.

‘ Their desire for unity rests on a moral not on an intellectual basis, and they impatiently ask “ Why do you not all agree to pick out what you have in common and to let all the rest go ? ” ’

‘ (3) *Intellectual causes.* It has been a permanent feature of the English people to show themselves incapable of theology. . . . We have had contentions enough, but we have contended not about ideas, but about external things. Englishmen cannot grasp an idea, they have a natural hatred for intellectual speculation. The whole method of the growth of scientific thought with which this age is permeated is averse to the conception of the truth having been once for all revealed. . . . Theology cannot be a developing science in the same sense as other sciences are, because truth does not change, though there is a variety in the truths which at different times most prominently occupy the thoughts of religious people ; at the beginning of this century the doctrine of the Atonement was emphasised, to-day the doctrine of the Incarnation.

‘ All these various tendencies combine to produce a nebulous form of religion. The desire to get at the spirit of a thing without going through the process necessary to understand it is very hazardous. People demand that theology should be immediately obvious to them without their having taken any trouble to get hold of it. This is partly due to the insolence so common at present, which leads a man to think that he can dispense with any discipline of character or of intelligence. . . . It leads to the destruction of Christianity as a religion, and converts it into a sort of moral philosophy, which rests upon the notion that the “ spiritual man ” is merely “ the natural ” man at his best, and does not realise that the “ spiritual man ” is a “ new creature. ”

‘ Religion is always decaying in the hands of the multitude ; it has to be revived by individuals, and we who are engaged in teaching Christianity as a religion, as the means of establishing a relation between the soul and God, must never allow it to fall into the sphere of the world’s activities.’

At the evening meetings of the ruri-decanal conferences, at which the lay members were present, the Bishop spoke this year on ‘ Purity.’ He maintained that it was an even more important question than that of temperance, but that very little had been done by the Christian Church to bring it forward. There had been a conspiracy of silence. He urged

that men should begin with their children, and try to warn and instruct their sons. He said that the existing confused thought on the matter arose from a heresy which had caused much difficulty by the confusion which it had made between the terms *flesh* and *body*. 'The body is God's gift to man; when not under due control it becomes the flesh, and is a source of evil. Let us try to restore the body to its proper dignity. All great literature, and especially that of the New Testament, recognises the dignity of the body. How many of its images, how much of its poetry, are drawn from child-bearing. This is one of the greatest and most obvious facts of life, and fathers ought to teach their sons concerning it.'

In February of this year, he opened a three days' mission on the same subject at St. James's, Piccadilly, and preached at a midnight service to a large congregation of men who had been gathered in from the streets outside by a band of lay-workers. One who mingled with the crowd as they dispersed, heard a man say, 'If we heard more talk from Bishops like this one down here, the condition of society would soon be altered.'

The question of the religious teaching in Board schools was once more attracting attention in view of the School-board election. The Bishop did not think it well to make any public utterance in connexion with the election. To one of the moderate party he wrote, 'My own view would be to enforce the legal and full observance of all that the Board system rendered possible.' After the election he tried to get the different religious parties to work together.

To the Hon. Evelyn Cecil

'October 9, 1897.

'Yesterday I agreed to be present at a conference with some nonconformist leaders to discuss the Orpington scheme. . . .

'I think we need not be unduly discouraged. The matter is so complicated that it is difficult to get any issue which is definite and does not seem to claim advantage for one party or another. We are labouring under the refuse of past controversy. Any proposal which contains the principle that we have a right to teach our children what we believe is to me valuable. At the same time I have not much hope of any result from the conference.'

To the Rev. W. F. Dawson, Congregational pastor, Lichfield

‘November 2, 1897.

‘My dear Sir,—I am obliged for your communication about religious teaching. I sincerely hope that all Christians will agree in asserting its primary importance, and will sink all minor differences before the maintenance of this great principle.’

Preaching on October 30 at the opening of the schools of St. Stephen's, Westbourne Park, he said, ‘The true patriot will strive to maintain in full force all those spiritual influences which play around the young soul and frame the character in youth. We may talk about environments and conditions of living; it is well to attend to these too; but it is to the operation of these spiritual influences, brought to bear upon the young mind by the teaching of Christian principles, that we must look for the formation of character and the power to sustain it in after years;’ and again: ‘To belittle religious education is to drop out the one thing which answers the child's question “Why should I learn at all?”’

Christmas brought a brief respite to his incessant work.

To Miss Margaret Goddard

‘January 8, 1898.

‘We both of us celebrated our festivities under altered circumstances this year. But it is odd how soon one feels about a house as if one had always lived there. I wish you would come and see Fulham: it is quite a nice place. We had a huge party: all the family at home, and six nephews and nieces. We made ourselves merry, played hockey, danced in the evenings, had a Christmas tree, and finally went to Barnum's circus. This was very frivolous.’

During these and other holidays, he enjoyed going with his children to some museum or picture gallery, or having a ramble amongst the City churches. He was a delightful cicerone, for he never tried to impose his views, and allowed everyone to go his own way, but was such a keen sightseer that others were kindled by his enthusiasm, and stimulated to try to understand and appreciate what they saw.

He notes that during 1897 he delivered 294 sermons and addresses of different kinds.

LETTERS 1897

To M. Pobiedonostzeff, Procurator of the Holy Synod in Russia

• Fulham Palace, S.W. : February 13, 1897.

‘My dear M. Pobiedonostzeff,—Thank you very much for your most interesting book,¹ which I have been reading as far as I have leisure. I agree with you about the strength of national sentiment, as expressed in the actual form assumed by religion, and the prominence consequently given to certain ideas. But I do not think that the attitude of the English Church is fairly expressed by Carlyle, Froude and Stephen. Carlyle was a Scottish Calvinist, Froude left the Church, and was avowedly a Christian at large : Stephen was an agnostic lawyer and judge, who never professed Christianity, but was a cultivated materialist . . . All these men express tendencies of the English character, which are real, and have done much to make England what it is—which also exist in some forms of popular religion. But they have never had their home in the English Church. I freely admit that the English Church has not found room for them, and therefore does not contain all the English people. Nonconformity seems to many minds more practical, and less imaginative. The English Church retains older conceptions, largely in accordance with yours, which in some respects do [not] accord with the lines of natural development.

‘I think that allowance must be made, in a survey of history, for the Teutonic *conscience*. I cannot say how it came about ; but the fact is clear that conscience has a larger hold of the Teuton than of the Latin or the Slav. This was the real strength of the Reformation. Conscience was appealed to as the supreme judge, and the intellectual controversy was only an expression of this in the region of theology. I admit that this setting of morality in the foremost place narrowed the scope of religion, and put much Christian truth in a secondary place. I admit that it set up a standard of morality which was mainly dictated by social needs rather than spiritual truth. But I think that the conscience created the form of religion, not that the theology of the sixteenth century formed a morality.

‘In your general view I agreed with you : but I think that the English Church, instead of being the chief instance of this Teutonic tendency, has witnessed against it, and has

¹ *Reflections of a Russian Statesman*. The Bishop refers especially to the essay on *The English Church*.

maintained, as far as it could, a larger and more spiritual view of truth.

‘But I did not mean to inflict my opinions upon you. I have come to a very large work, which will never leave me time to write again, and little time even to think. I can only say that I learned much from my visit to Moscow, and that my sympathy will always be with you.’

To his niece Winifred

‘February 18, 1897.

‘I feel tempted to say something about your remark that living in Naworth would not be commonplace but dreamlike. I am afraid that life is and must be commonplace. Dreams are only possible occasionally, and we always want to make what is exceptional become ordinary. This cannot be. We love things because of their unlikeness to what we have or do. Relief comes from change, but we cannot discover anything from which no relief is needed. Life always consists of humdrum duties, and difficulties are the same whatever are the surroundings . . . Everybody’s life is his own, and depends on training oneself to see the limits of our possibilities and how all happiness comes from within.

To the Rev. Canon Benham

‘Fulham Palace : March 31, 1897.

‘My dear Dr. Benham,—Your subject [for his proposed Boyle lectures] is interesting, and ought to be profitable. May I make a remark about ‘the awakening of *conscience*’?

‘It is only a question of words: but do you think that *conscience* was the first religious faculty? I think *conscience* is a term which ought to be rather carefully guarded for a special sense. Even Socrates had a rudimentary notion of it, which he could only express in a theological and mystic sense. Aristotle is vague about it. St. Paul in Romans i. first specifies the function of *συνείδησις*. It was left for Butler to analyse conscience: and the results of his analysis are now constantly blurred by a loose use of the word.

‘I advise you to put “religious consciousness” for “conscience.” But you may not agree with me. You mean, I take it, the power of perceiving God and thinking of Him.’

To the Bishop of Rochester

(on the death of Rev. R. Wilson, Warden of Keble College)

‘Fulham Palace : May 16, 1897.

‘My dear Bishop,—Alas, I knew that there was but one end possible, and that speedy. But we have lost a friend who was not like anybody else. Perhaps I knew him before you

did—and then he was another Wilson, yet the same. He always went his own way, and was more free from self-seeking than most men. Fastidious almost to a fault, he was the soul of honour and loyalty. His great quality was that he thought out things for himself, and had a singularly clear insight into the important tendencies of movements. His judgment was singularly sound.

To the Rev. H. Rowsell

‘Fulham Palace, S.W. : June 4, 1897.

‘Dear Mr. Rowsell,— . . . ‘It is a plain fact that Augustine’s coming was the beginning of Christianity. The sees of Canterbury, London, and Rochester date from him. He sent Paulinus to Northumbria, but his work was undone. Still there is great reason to point the analogy between mission work now and then. When Central Africa is civilised and has its Church, I hope that its people will recall the first missionaries, be they Roman, Anglican, Scottish, or English—whether their form of Christianity was permanent or not. The wisdom and love of Pope Gregory, the zeal of Augustine, are facts which as Christians we ought to be proud to recall; and I think we ought to claim them as achievements of a common Christianity which lies beyond all controversy, and proves nothing but the desire of Christians to make the Gospel known.’

To G. H.

‘July 1, 1897.

‘About your brothers, I do not think you will do much good by arguing, or by letting them talk about things wildly. They will only say things more strongly than they think for the purpose of annoying you. Your position might well be this: “You know my opinions; and you know I do not agree with yours; when you want my help, I will give it to you as much as I can, but no good is done to either of us by talking about these things on which we differ. . . .” But I think generally you will find that the good you do will come from your own character and example. This does more than talk. People are rarely convinced by argument, but are moved by the sight of another kind of life. It is not our wisdom that helps, but our goodness. The power of simple goodness is the greatest in the world, and you may have that if you pursue it.’

The following letter was written to a man unknown to the Bishop, who wrote to say that he was dying of an incurable, painful complaint, and was without faith, that he could not

accept the Christian Faith. He implored to be told what book he should study to guide him in the right path.

‘Fulham Palace : July 15, 1897.

‘My dear Sir,—You have my deepest sympathy. Last year I had to stand by and see my only brother die of the same disease as you describe. He was suddenly informed that he had no more than three months to live, and it was so.

‘I would that I could help you. I know the sincerity that comes from the imperative demand for a clear and steady outlook on life and its end. Let me make a few suggestions.

‘There can be no *convincing proof* of anything that affects our inner character. What “convincing proof” have you that your wife loves you or your child? Yet you believe it, and that belief is more real to you than anything that you know or can prove. Religion must be a matter of belief, not of proof. It depends on a consciousness of the relation between our soul and God. Immortality depends on the knowledge of the meaning of our soul’s life which we obtain from looking at it in the light of God. The more we find our soul, the more readily do we see God in the person of Jesus Christ. Look back upon your own life, your growth, the traces of Providence, the presence of God’s love. Do you think that all this wonderful process can come to an abrupt end?

‘These are general considerations. I can only commend them to you. There is nothing that can be said in proof of this to you. Look into your own heart; pray, and ask God to enlighten you. Reading will not help you; argument on either side is barren. The only thing I can recommend to you is the Gospel of St. John. Read it and weigh it. Consider the view of life which it contains. May God bless you, for He alone can do so.

‘I am your sympathising brother in Christ,

‘M. LONDON :’

His correspondent answered thanking him earnestly, and saying that he would follow his advice, and later his wife wrote that he died three months afterwards in perfect peace and faith.

To a friend who had been left a widow

‘Glenridding House, Penrith : August 17, 1897.

‘. . . You must feel all the weariness and desolation you can before you can emerge. Think that no life which leaves ennobling memories has disappeared. It is there still, active and operative; changed in form, working another way, but

equally near. The limits of time and space belong only to our imperfection. We can transcend them even here. The task before you is to live into a larger and less personal world ; I mean a world in which sight and touch go for less, and feeling and impulse go for more. It is a process which we all have to go through. Even if there be not separation, the advance of years demands it equally. All whom we know and love have to fade from forms into influences, but become stronger by so doing.'

To G. H.

'Glenridding House : August 10, 1897.

'It is dreadful when a man does not respect and love his wife ; but it is hard for anyone else to put it right. The only advice you or anyone can give to a wife is to hold to her husband and try to improve him. Let her learn to keep her own temper, and in time she may succeed in turning him to a better way. But it is necessary that she should make him *respect* her ; she may not be able to do this by her wisdom or cleverness, but she can always move him by her goodness in the long run. To be patient, not to answer back, to do her best quietly—these are hard things to do, but they can be done. . . . No good can come from leaving him. She would be equally unhappy, and he would grow worse. If a woman marries a man, it must be because she saw something in him once ; she must remember that and try to make it real.'

'Ivrea : September 14, 1897.

'It is hard to learn how little we can do for another. It seems so easy to put them right ; such a little change is necessary ; the matter seems so easy to explain. But they will not listen to one's explanation, nor do what one advises. You have to learn that the only thing you can really do for another is to pray for him. You see people do not do wrong because they do not know what is right, but because they have no proper motive to do it. This is the real point about religion. It gives a motive to do the will of God. We all of us know the strength of the motive of doing the will of someone wiser and better than ourselves. This finds its true expression in doing God's will. You seem to think that if you were wiser, you might help others more. I doubt if this is really so. It is a belief in their own wisdom which leads them astray. They say, "Other people are foolish ; I will think and act for myself." It is of little use to argue with them. They think you are bound by vulgar prejudices. All you can do is to hold up the simple truth, that happiness does not lie in self-assertion and self-seeking, but in humble

submission and teachableness to a higher law. You see the two points of view are so different that you cannot meet by talking. It is the little child who enters into the kingdom of heaven; the carnal mind cannot understand the things of God. Those who will not learn cannot learn. It is not your wisdom but your simplicity which will help others. Yet there is a wisdom which we all need—greater knowledge of God's will. Read the first chapter of the Epistle of St. James, and you will find the use of trial (there called temptation) and the use of wisdom set forth. You must do what you can and never lose hope, and leave yourself and others to God.'

To his niece Winifred

' Lugano : September 10.

' Don't make efforts to write to me, but brabble on as if you were talking, and tell me all that you are thinking about. You know that I want to get you to unpack yourself. We all begin by being vague and dreamy, and the process of life is to get us to see things clearly. We can never do this except by writing. Even talking is nothing compared to writing. Ideas when put into shape stay with us, and we can recall them and correct them. So please write to me very fully about yourself. . . . Success in life means making one's life large. We all live in the same world, but each of us lives in that part of the world which we choose to make our own. Your danger is to live in a small world because you cannot take the trouble to explore. I want you to feel, and think, and struggle into more and more ideas. I am glad you enjoy Stevenson : he is a perfectly wholesome-minded writer, which many are not. His world is a nice world, and this makes all the difference.'

To C. D.

' Fulham Palace : April 29, 1897.

' I just have time to jot down a few remarks on the matter of Christianity and progress. What is *progress*? I suppose man's adaptation of himself to his surroundings, growth of knowledge, industry, &c. But does that give *happiness*? Obviously not : it makes life harder to all, to governors and governed alike. We find, as a matter of fact, that former civilisations perished because it was too troublesome to carry them on. The work exceeded the capacity. Look at Babylon, Egypt, Assyria, &c. Then Rome made a longer stand, but went at last. Why? Because it could not produce strong enough characters to do its work any longer.

' What makes progress possible? The existence of resolute characters to do a nation's work.

‘What creates and maintains such characters? Nothing in the long run, but a strong ideal of the nation’s destiny. And this ideal must be religious. There is no other form possible. Rome flourished so long as a simple religion made simple patriotism possible. It fell when its people became agnostics. Now any form of religion tends to degenerate in the multitude. The point about Christianity is that it is capable of infinite revivals. The Christian religion has been made the covering of many political projects which were not wise. It has never been permanently associated with them, but has supplied the means of overthrowing them. You say that only now-a-days are we beginning to know the meaning of justice and mercy. Men have always *known*: they have not always acted up to their knowledge. We do not do so yet. We talk more sentiment on these points: do we act up to it? Some time ago a friend of mine said “Modern philanthropy is merely a refinement of selfishness: We are so desirous of being comfortable, that we want to make every body else comfortable *because it diminishes our own comfort to think they are not so.*” There is much truth in this jibe. Look deeper, and you will see that, though moral aims are common to all good men, Christianity alone supplies motive to pursue them, which is capable of universal extension.’

‘The Athenæum: May 26, 1897.

‘Every science exists to its experts as a body of truth: outsiders go and pick up what they want from it, as interesting to them, and know that they are not experts and are not fit to criticise the system.

‘But in theological matters every outsider asserts that what fits him is the whole system, and denounces any scientific system at all—i.e. he does not admit that theology is concerned with truth, but with the satisfaction of his particular needs.

‘The orthodox theologian is really the same as the expert in any other science. No other science so directly touches human life; therefore the truth has a greater risk of being dissolved to suit fashion.

‘If Jesus was not God, Christianity is not a religion, but a contribution to moral philosophy. It is in this latter way that it appeals to you. But mankind want a religion: and it is as a religion that Christianity works in the world.

‘Moral philosophy bids us make the best of ourself, prefer the higher to the lower, love virtue, &c. Religion tells how we can see God, be helped by Him, resign our life to Him,

trust in Him because we believe in an eternal life with Him. This life with God is made certain to a Christian because Jesus Christ, the Son of God, unveiled on earth the human life of God.

‘You tend to draw a vast distinction between the divine and the human. The Incarnation declares that the distinction is not insuperable. And this is the most important practical point. Think it out, consider the difference between saying “I wish to be a very good man,” and “I wish to be like God.” The Unitarian says the first, the Christian says the last. But the motives appealed to are worlds apart.’

‘Faiddo, Italy : August 30, 1897.

‘I cannot answer your arguments. I can rarely undertake to answer anyone. It is quite natural for us to approach any subject for the purpose of receiving individual satisfaction, and to reject with scorn everything that does not fit ourselves. Christianity is a series of principles. I cannot defend entirely any form of organisation which has endeavoured to set them forth. I notice failures serious and damaging. But then, liberty is a principle, and I notice far more grievous failures in every system which has claimed to set forth liberty. The Christian Church may have been inadequate, but it has always maintained Christianity : institutions established to maintain liberty generally in fifty years’ time have maintained the opposite. There is always a charm in the critic who points out inconsistencies. But if he remains there, he is merely a parasite. Parasites have their use no doubt, but they have no separate existence. The sceptic has his use, but it all springs from the system which he criticises. So long as he is a critic, he is bound to show that he can do as well as those whom he criticises. But if he were to succeed in criticising them out of existence, where would he be ?

‘Our individual life consists in the consciousness of a purpose : this consciousness cannot go far unless it reaches to a divine purpose, which runs through the universe. Those who proclaim such a purpose, and hold to it, are miles above those who have it not : even though the first fail to appreciate the responsibility of their knowledge, while the second supply their defects. The reason is that the first uphold an absolutely necessary truth, on which individual happiness and human progress alike depend : the second do useful work, of a mechanical kind, in their day and generation, but have no outlook and produce no abiding results. The history of the Christian Church is a singular instance of this. Its strength

in early days lay in the fact that there was a body of men who had a conception of life and character, which conception was a bond of unity between them. The Church grew into power because there was no other basis which could bind men together. Yet Marcus Aurelius, Marcus Antoninus and Julian were probably much more admirable men than the mass of contemporary bishops. They uttered nobler sentiments, they behaved in an exemplary manner : but there was no motive which they could communicate to others ; no power which they could infuse into society. At the present day there are numbers of men like them ; but " the least in the kingdom of heaven are greater than they." You say truly that they are not happy. They are working for results which they know they cannot obtain. More and more they grimly do their duty—both the sense of duty and the definition of its contents coming to them from Christianity. They have a horrible feeling of insecurity ; for if they turned their scepticism against this sense of duty, as they have done against Christianity, duty would go at once.

' Religion consists in a knowledge of a divine purpose in the world : Christianity is a grasp of this purpose applied to our own life. Will you read with an open mind Psalm 100, Psalm 146, and the Te Deum in this order, and I think you will see, if you meditate, how absolutely they set forth the secret of happiness and of effort in a progressive way.

' I feel that if I were to demand individual satisfaction in life, there would be an end of all things. I was born into certain surroundings, I begin from them, I strive to understand them and realise their full meaning. I do not yet feel capable of using all that men before me have acquired : my own contribution to their labours is infinitely small. If, instead of this mental attitude, I took myself as I was thirty years ago, and made that self the measure by which everything was to be tested, I quail to think of the results. It is quite true that all men are fools, but then I am a man myself, and as such a fool. I cannot exempt myself from the universal experience of my predecessors. I cannot waive away all the teaching of history : I cannot undertake to reconstruct human society, human knowledge, and human aspiration.

' There has always been this " Sturm und Drang " : it is in many cases a phase. But in England of the present day, indeed in the world at large, it is a positive malady. There is too much liberty of thought and speech and action. By " too much " I mean more than people know how to use. There is no sense of discipline and little sense of responsi-

bility. If a man says "I think so-and-so," sometimes I am inclined to say, "Friend, what right have you to think at all about such matters? You seem to hold that the statement that you have gone through a process, which you are pleased to call thinking, gives an inherent value to the results which you are good enough to state."

'Frankly, we have gained a notion of liberty which has no contents. We live in a perfect bacchanalia of nonsense. The great question of the future is the discipline of liberty. But remember that to live for God is to live for man. But what is meant by living for man in that formula? Most people seem to mean the provision of armchairs for the intelligent artisan. I distinctly mean the setting forth of the truth about man's life, man's character, and man's destiny. Armchairs will bring no lasting happiness either to him who receives or him who provides them. But to quicken any human being into a sense of the meaning of his life and destiny—this is the one source of real happiness for us all.

'There, I have written you a useless letter. You will say it is clever, but unsatisfactory. God forgive me for not being a better man, and so more able to speak out His truth. God bless you, my dear. If you only ask Him, He will teach you.'

'Fulham Palace : October 13, 1897.

'Your frame of mind is right. The question is how to get hold for oneself of the principles and motives of the spiritual life. General considerations about how everyone else ought to do so, do not do much towards helping oneself. It is part of the modern craze to set society right, instead of setting oneself right. So long as one bears one's own life in one's hands, the burden grows intolerable. It is only by seeing that life as part of a universal life that peace is found. And the life of man is set forth in the Life of Jesus, who gives His Spirit and His Life to those who seek it. He gives little by little as we are able to receive. We must make room for Him : all lies in that. We do not so much want opinions about life—there are plenty of them—but an object and a motive. If once you grasp this truth, the answer comes of itself. It is not we who find out God : He finds us out. . . . I am at the grindstone again, but I am trying not to be so close to it.'

To the Bishop of Colombo (Dr. Copleston)

'Fulham : November 3, 1897.

'My dear Bishop,— . . . I quite agree with you about the distinction between visible unity and structural unity.

I hold that nations with their diversities of temperament, institutions and customs are part of that divine order which is revealed in the facts of human history. But, then, the English mind is as yet under the bondage of the iron system of the Western Church, and still hankers after uniformity. We shall get on gradually, but we need your help with your Imperial ideas. I stick them in whenever I have a chance, but I cannot say that they are yet popular. We must get on slowly.'

To Mr. J. Terry

'Fulham Palace: December 31, 1897.

'Dear Sir,—The question of the authorship of Shakspeare's plays cannot well be discussed by itself. It is part of another question. Can we at the present day hope to go behind the belief of persons who were contemporary? If so, on what evidence?

'The theory that Bacon wrote Shakspeare's plays depends on the following prejudice:

'Shakspeare's plays are the greatest works in the English language. Therefore they must have been written by a very distinguished man: but Shakspeare was a common man without great learning, therefore they were not written by him. Bacon was the most distinguished man of that time; therefore they were written by Bacon.

'Starting from this theory, it only needs a little ingenuity to discover anagrams; but Donnelly's theory of anagrams has been refuted by a clergyman near Stratford, whose name I forget. A little more ingenuity on the other side is always available.

'But we have some positive evidence, which is in anyone's power to appreciate. Read Bacon's essay on "Love" and then read "Romeo and Juliet." It is a question of common sense if a man who could be so frigid when he wrote under his own name, could be so impassioned when he wrote under another name.

'Really the question is one of the nature of poetic imagination. The poet does not need learning, but quick perception. The knowledge shown in Shakspeare's plays is that of the artist, not of the man of science. The poet reproduces what he sees; the man of science analyses what he observes. The poet could not write science, nor the man of science poetry.

'I do not see any reason for trying to explain away Shakspeare's authorship.'

CHAPTER VIII

THE BISHOP AND HIS CLERGY

THE spirit in which the Bishop approached his work is shown by a letter to a former Leicester incumbent.

To the Rev. E. Grose Hodge ‘Fulham Place : February 3, 1897.

‘My dear Hodge.—You are the only one of my parochial clergy whom I really know, and you know something at least of the spirit in which I try to do the difficult work of a Bishop in the Church of England as it is at this day. Those difficulties are at their height in London, and you know that I have no belief in my exclusive possession of wisdom. But you also know that my sympathies are genuinely with every form of opinion, and that my object is to bring them all into close union, without asking them to compromise, but only to be large-hearted. Differences do not matter, but the way in which we express them.’

From the first he saw that his path would be beset with difficulties. The conditions of London, which is always the home of free lances, had fostered the growth of every kind of eccentricity and exuberant individualism, whilst the sense of the unity of the Church had been largely lost sight of.

Dr. Creighton's position is best defined by his own words in a letter to one of his clergy : ‘You know that my wish is to maintain the widest possible liberty compatible with the existence of the Church of England as a distinct branch of the Catholic Church. Its position is defined in the Prayer Book : and the services there contained must not be resolved into other services even of a similar type ;’ and again : ‘I have a very strong opinion of the magnificent position of the Church of England, which we never realise and refuse to understand and make imperative through our littleness of mind : I would rejoice if I could do anything to bring us into such a line and order as would enable us to do the work which God has entrusted to us.’

He explained to his diocesan conference in 1898 his conception of his relation to his clergy.

‘There is one thing which I should like to say as regards my conception of the Episcopal office. It is that all the clergy of this Diocese are alike the objects of my personal concern and my personal care, however mistaken I may think them to be in some points, and whether I personally agree with them or not. Those are not the questions which, in the first instance, it is for me to ask myself.’

He thus expressed what he felt about the position of a bishop: ‘The root of episcopal authority is the need of preserving unity between various congregations. This was its original purpose. Each clergyman may have his own view about what is good for his own people. The bishop has to consider what is good for the whole Church.’ He told his first diocesan conference that, though new as a bishop of London, he was not new as a bishop, and that he did not mind telling them a line of policy he had found wise to adopt—‘never to give orders that you believe will not be obeyed.’

‘My chief duty,’ he said, ‘at present is, I feel, one of quiet observation. But I must withdraw that epithet and substitute another for it—it is one of unquiet observation; for quietness is not an attribute which is possible for a bishop of London. I can only assure you that I try to think, when I have a few minutes to spare for that purpose; and that what time is over from answering questions in the course of the day I try to devote to asking questions for my own information . . . not being by nature or training a believer in government by means of happy thoughts, I prefer not to construct policies, nor to give utterance to my intentions, until I have had ample means of studying the details of various questions. However, one thing at least I should like to say, which is, that in nothing whatever am I wedded to my own ways of doing anything; and that my one desire is that the course which is pursued may be the largest, the wisest and the best.’

What the Bishop did ask of his clergy as troubles and perplexities increased, was that they should trust him, and be ready to be guided by him, because his position enabled him to see the wisest course to take, in a way impossible to those whose outlook was not so extensive.

His purpose to deal quietly with the irregularities in his

diocese was, of course, not understood. He was accused of 'contemptuous indifference,' of 'masterly inactivity tempered by epigram,' when 'clear and outspoken guidance' was expected. But he knew the nature of the task before him, he could see the pitfalls on every side, and had sufficient strength, to use his own words, 'to screw his head on tight,' and pursue his object untroubled by hostile criticism. But he much disliked the publicity which attached itself to his smallest act, and the way in which his letters were printed without his permission. He writes, 'I mark my letters private, because everything which I write seems to be published, in a way which almost destroys confidential communication'; and again, 'It is worth while noting that the difficulty of a bishop of London in dealing in a friendly way with his clergy is enormous. If he writes a letter, it is at once forwarded to the E.C.U. office, is filed for everyone to see, and he is said to have sanctioned universally something which in a particular case he is prepared to overlook. If he has a friendly talk, it is at once misrepresented in any form from which most capital may be made.'

The 'temper' with which church difficulties were met often called out his severest censure.

'The perpetual difficulty of all things in England is that each individual Englishman is profoundly convinced that he alone is right; and consequently he is determined to have his own way. Having arrived at this conclusion, he picks up any statement which enables him to express himself forcibly, and I believe he calls this an argument. I am never sure that I am intelligent enough to understand a man's intellectual position; but I think it possible to appreciate his temper and the moral qualities which lie beneath his utterances.

'It is the curse of this diocese, and of this present time, that everyone is labelled and thrust into the terms of some party . . . I know no shibboleths, and my one desire is to get all things into proportion and judge them by inevitable principles of thought, religious, intellectual, social. I always have before my eyes the advice of Gamaliel, and I am convinced that the purposes of God are not to be wrought by the wrath of man.'

He was convinced that many difficulties would disappear,

if only the right temper were shown by the clergy. Speaking to a ruri-decanal conference in 1897, he said :

‘The clergy are often to blame, because in practice they fail to set forth the spiritual side of the Christian life. They too often adopt the world’s way of looking at things. Let the clergy give up looking for outward signs of success, and competing one with another. To the laity they often appear to be “running a church” as a man runs a business concern. . . . Again there is a popular opinion, not ill founded, that the clergy wish to lord it over their people, and a feeling that the “ecclesiastical temper” is incompatible with modern ideas of liberty. “The unworthy clergy” are not only the immoral and drunken, but also the insolent, arrogant and self-asserting men, who will have their own way in everything.’

He was always careful not to raise unnecessary questions, or to give an opening for criticism ; and at the same time most anxious to understand the point of view of those who differed from him, and to talk over things with his clergy. He never forgot a principle of his own, ‘You have to deal with a person as he is, not as you would like him to be.’ Very many of his clergy, many even from whom he most differed in opinion, quickly learnt to love and trust him as a friend. He was ever ready to give an encouraging word, and to show that he had noticed and appreciated devoted service.

When the Bishop first went to London his suffragans were Dr. Earle, Bishop of Marlborough, and Dr. G. F. Browne, Bishop of Stepney, whilst Bishop Barry, then vicar of St. James’, Piccadilly, acted as assistant bishop. When at the end of 1897 Dr. G. F. Browne became Bishop of Bristol, the Rev. A. F. Winnington Ingram succeeded him as Bishop of Stepney. In 1898 Dr. Creighton was able to present the Rev. C. H. Turner to the living of St. Andrew Undershaft, and at the same time make him a new suffragan, with the title of Bishop of Islington ; and when in 1900 the Bishop of Marlborough became Dean of Exeter, the Bishop chose Dr. F. E. Ridgeway to succeed him, with the more suitable title of Bishop of Kensington. Each of his suffragans worked in a special district, but the Bishop did not in any definite way make over to them the charge of their district. He tried

himself to go as much as possible to every part of his diocese and be in touch with all his clergy. He saw his suffragans and archdeacons frequently. 'I wish,' he wrote, 'for the fullest and most intimate relations with all my officials.' He asked their advice on all matters connected with appointments, which in a diocese like London have special difficulties. The principles which guided him in such matters are shown in the following letters :

To Archdeacon Sinclair

' March 22, 1899.

' Some of the prebendaries of the Cathedral ought to be taken from men who have leisure to attend its services and love it, and are interested in it. I like the thought of the Cathedral being the bond which binds the aged to the diocese.'

' May 23, 1900.

' Dear Canon McCormick,—The patronage of the bishop of London is made very difficult by the circumstances of the diocese. There are twice as many curates as incumbents . . . Generally speaking a man is not considered eligible for preferment till he has been sixteen years in Orders, and has worked at least nine or ten years in the diocese.

I have to look to private patrons, the Crown and trustees to bring in new blood. But I feel that the curates are left to my care.'

Brief and to the point were his judgments on the men brought under his notice for possible preferment by his archdeacons and others. 'A. is never quiet, he only wishes to have a chance of telling you and me what a great man he is.' 'I have a great regard for B., he is a very sensible and nice-minded man, thoroughly zealous, but not showy.' 'It has always seemed to me that C. is so much occupied in maintaining his own dignity that he had no time for much else.' 'A man who can rejoice heartily at the success of a subordinate has greater qualities than if he succeeded himself.' 'D. is a difficult man to work with, and is lazy and slovenly in some things. But his utterances are pathetic.' 'E. is not a bad fellow, but conceited and feather-headed. A period of retreat would be good for him.'

He regretted that the size of his Ordinations made it difficult for him to see much of the candidates individually,

but he always managed to know something about them all. How he struck them is shown by the following extract out of a letter from one whom he had ordained, to his father :

‘During my days at Fulham I was deeply impressed and delighted with the splendid agility and keenness of his intellect, as manifested, for instance, by the way he summed up two debates, piercing unerringly, and with the joy of the true logician, down to the roots of the subject. But far deeper than that is my impression of his qualities of heart and spirit, as evidenced first at the closing address in chapel, and then at the ordination itself. At both of them it struck me that he was the most moved man present. He spoke from his heart—sitting in his chair in the almost dark chapel, and I for one will always remember his words. And yet this was his ordinary routine work ! But, in fact, his ideal of the life of a clergyman was boundlessly high, and when he spoke of it to those who were just assuming it, his voice had in it the sternness and the tenderness of a prophet. I believe him to have been one of the kingliest of men. I had two personal interviews with him ; he took one’s hand in both of his, and his voice grew kind and tender. He knelt down with me in his room, and committed me to God, a prayer from his heart, not a book.’

The days before the Ordination were arranged in the same way as at Peterborough. But the candidates had to be dismissed on the Saturday evening, otherwise it would have been difficult for them all to get to St. Paul’s Cathedral in time for the Ordination Service. The custom had been for them to scatter directly after the service, but the Bishop arranged a lunch for them at the Chapter House, where he could meet them once more and say good-bye to them.

His chaplains were the two archdeacons, the Rev. H. E. Bevan, and the Rev. W. Murdoch Johnston, who had filled the same office under his predecessor, and the Rev. C. Bigg, D.D., and the Rev. A. T. Lyttelton, who had been his chaplains at Peterborough. When Mr. Lyttelton resigned on becoming Bishop of Southampton, Prebendary Covington succeeded him. The Bishop supported his chaplains in trying to keep up a high standard, in spite of the murmurs of incumbents, ‘It must be understood that the examination is a reality,’ he wrote ; ‘I agree with you that congregations cannot fail to consider it discreditable that those who undertake to teach

them will not undertake to learn.' To some criticisms on the preparation of candidates he replied :

‘January 7, 1900.

‘I think Mr. — does not know the facts about other bodies ; they are infinitely more shocking. In the Greek Church the majority of the priests are quite ignorant of theology. In the Roman Church the results of the seminary system [are] that a large proportion are really agnostics or unbelievers, but cannot practically escape, as they have been paid for, and have no other opening in life, and dare not go home to poor parents.

‘No system can be perfect : but ours is at least as good as any other : better in that it throws all the responsibility on the individual. Can we do more ?

‘People make an ideal of the Roman system. I wish they knew its real working.’

A curate in any difficulties with his incumbent might be sure of having his case carefully considered by the Bishop :

‘He deemed it his own proper province to adjust the difficulty, grudging neither time nor trouble to the work of pacification. He generally insisted upon drastic measures, avoiding the compromises by which a weaker man would be tempted to heal the wound slightly. He made the bishop’s part in a curate’s licence a much greater reality than it had been before. He distinctly discouraged a hasty licence. But when once the curate was licensed, both incumbent and curate were made to feel that the Bishop was party to their engagement, and must be consulted before it could be dissolved. This, of course, has always been the legal position, but the bishops have been very reluctant to exercise their powers, and it needed the courage of Bishop Creighton to refuse permission to an incumbent to give his curate six months’ notice. But while ready to uphold the rights of the curate, the Bishop was equally decided in not allowing him to invade the province in which the incumbent was responsible. He said emphatically to the incumbent, “You are responsible for the manner in which the services are to be conducted. The congregation ought not to be distracted by various uses. It is your duty to give directions and to insist upon their being followed.”’¹

In the opinion of the public it might seem that the chief question before the Church in these years was the dispute

¹ From an article by Canon Whitworth in the *Church Quarterly*.

about ritual. But though this naturally occupied the serious attention of the Bishop, the regular work and interests of the diocese were never neglected. Above all, he felt the need for strengthening the spiritual agencies in London, and for this the great means was the Bishop of London's Fund, started in 1863 by Dr. Tait. He said, 'I do not think we sufficiently understand what an absolutely unique problem London presents. . . . We are facing conditions and circumstances which have never before existed in the history of the world.' At one of the annual meetings for the Fund he said that he would like 'to organise expeditions in brakes to show dwellers in the West End something of the London which surrounded them. London means a great many different things to different people, but to the Fund I apprehend London very much means those endless rows of little houses, all exactly alike, which go on growing like mushrooms, so that when you go to a place where you have not been for a few months, you see an entire change in the whole district.' 'For the people who came up to London from the country, or who moved from the centre to the suburbs, there could be nothing worse than to find themselves in a "No-Man's land." The constant growth of a ring round London of spiritually desolate and deserted places would be a great menace; to prevent this is the work of the Bishop of London's Fund. . . . All who live in London must recognise their responsibility to help in the work.' He wanted to prevail upon the laity to relieve the clergy from the toil of constant begging needed to plant a church in a new district. 'It is rather hard for a young clergyman who is filled with the zeal for saving souls that he should be required to have in addition the qualifications of a commercial traveller. He has to have a brazen face when asking for money, a talent for writing begging letters, and determination enough never to meet anybody in the street without preferring an appeal. This is not the sort of thing which should be expected of a clergyman.'

He always tried to win interest for that outer ring of new suburbs which sprang up with such alarming rapidity on the west and north. The need of the East End had been realised but few were aware of the desolation of the far west and of the north.

Like others he felt the attraction of the East End. Speaking for the East London Church Fund, in 1897, he said :

‘What strikes me is that there is so much more life in the East End than in the West End, there is none of the respectable dulness which characterises other parts of London. Eastenders are to a great extent children of nature, they are frank, free, open, above all responsive. Their interests are keen, they are animated by a genuine joy in life, and by the desire to get the most out of it they can. . . . I am also struck by the extreme geniality and cheerfulness of the East-End clergy. . . . Nobody can achieve anything by going about with a long face. There is all the difference in the world between the man whom you feel you could slap on the back if you felt so disposed and the man whom you could not slap on the back in any circumstances whatever ; and the clergy in the East End are all men whom you can slap on the back. The work must go on slowly, we cannot quickly make up arrears in spiritual things. There are many who say that spiritual agencies are ceasing to influence the people as much as they did in past times. I do not believe it in the least. I do not believe that there ever was a time in the history of England when the general principles of religion had a stronger hold on the people as a mass . . . to my mind the Church is the chief power which will mould the England of the future.’

He delighted in an East End meeting, with its alive and responsive audience, and loved the crowds of children who waited for him round his carriage when he came out from preaching or speaking, and would speak to them and shake as many little eager outstretched hands as possible.

Very different opinions were held about his preaching. There were those who would rather hear him than anyone else, others who thought that it was as a preacher he shone least. He was not what would be called a popular preacher. But, as was said of him, ‘he compelled men’s attention by making them see that he had something to tell them.’ Business men especially liked to hear him. His own belief in the mission of the nation and its intimate connexion with the religion of the nation never failed to show itself. In these later years he dwelt much on the prophetic books of the Bible ; many of the texts of his sermons were taken from them, and he deeply felt their bearing upon modern life. Preaching

at the consecration of St. Gabriel's Church, Willesden, in 1897, he said :

'A nation must have a duty and a responsibility. Yet the prophets show us a nation who are constantly setting aside the higher forms of life, and making a great rejection of what they know to be their eternal destiny. . . . There is an appalling similarity between life then and the life of the English people. We, too, feel the force of the prophet's reproof, and we ask "What can I do in my day and generation for this people from whom I spring, for this nation founded on a sense of liberty which it is its mission to pass on to the world?" We, too, are on our trial. Isaiah pictures a civilisation tottering to decay. We must not think that life was different then from what it is at present. Everything went on then pretty much as now. There was to be a downfall, but it would not be complete ; there was to be a restoration, but it could only be found in the right way. There was God, and God was not to be known except by those who walked in the right way, distinct and clear through the world. But from that great broad highway people are always wandering and they have to come back to it.'

He enjoyed preaching at Lincoln's Inn or the Temple.

To the Master of the Temple 'London House : March 18, 1898.

'Dear Ainger,—Wearied as I am of preaching, I enjoyed the opportunity of speaking once in a way to an educated congregation where I could use the words that came into my head, and had not to translate them into simple forms. How beautiful the Temple Church is ! I enjoyed hearing a fine anthem of Pergolesi. Elsewhere I am persecuted with Stainer, &c.'

The fact that so many religious communities have their centre in London brought him into close contact with Sisters and their work ; and his relations with them were most friendly. He was a member of the Committee on Communities appointed by the Lambeth Conference.

The results of his experience are shown by the following criticisms on the constitution of a new sisterhood :

'Generally I think you have given too great power to the warden, whose office ought not to contain anything that affects initiative of new work or interference with the executive, which I would advise you to reserve to the superior.

‘The community should be self-governing. You invite a warden to help you on the lines which you have laid down : there is no need that he should have any power to alter or direct them. He is your spiritual officer, let him have influence, not power, within your constitution.

‘But I feel strongly that the office of visitor ought to be in accordance with ancient precedent. I see some of the suggestions indicate a jealousy of the visitor. This is the bad point about sisterhoods. They want to be absolutely independent, obedient only to their own will. Such a claim is entirely unworthy. We must all work in obedience and cannot afford to do without it. But observe, the obedience is only to your constitution. The office of visitor is merely that of guardian and interpreter of the statutes. He has no power of interference. He has merely to pronounce if you are keeping your own laws. The proposal to depose him if you do not like him is subversive of all rule. He is your judge chosen by yourselves : he must be for life, and must be independent of your will. He must have a veto on change of the constitution in important matters : for by undertaking the post he gives a guarantee to the general public of your object and your methods. You must not use him and then throw him away when you are started. A bishop is already visitor of many institutions, he is not likely to interfere unless there is strong cause. The fear is of too little rather than too much.’

‘July 17, 1900.

‘I think that great ignorance prevails about the office of visitor. No office is more strictly defined and formal. He is merely the person to whom recourse is to be made for a judicial decision as to the meaning of the statutes in case of difference. His sole duty is to see that the statutes are observed. No society can exist without such an officer. It otherwise ends in anarchy.

‘I may say of myself that I have had an increasing amount of work to do in reference to communities. It is not too much to say that I stand in intimate connexion with them all in the diocese. The superiors frequently consult me about all sorts of matters. This arises from the way in which I am known to exercise my visitorial office. I think that I have now established a series of precedents which have put this point on a regular basis. What communities suffer from is unauthorised intervention from outside. This can only be met by immediate reference to the visitor. Communities now find this a real advantage. My letters this morning contain two grateful acknowledgments from two superiors

of the settlement by me of two awkward disputes. I have always found it easy to settle matters by accurate reference to the rule. Without such an authority existing there is no possibility of orderly government.'

With the St. Andrew's Deaconess' House, which trained deaconesses for work in the London Diocese, his relations were naturally specially close. The deaconesses dwell on his fatherly tenderness, and look back to the five visits which he paid their house as 'sacred memories.' They write, 'To see him seated, with our little sanctuary as a background, vested in cope and mitre, and to hear him speak then, suggested a vision out of the Apocalypse. It was a glory of spiritual and mental and physical richness of colour that filled the heart with a sense of completeness, seldom experienced in life as we know it. Who would have thought (though we knew it) that he had come in out of the midst of an almost incessant round of turmoil, and was just going out into the midst of it again? . . . When he appeared among us in the community room, after his duties were over, we were very apt to forget the *bishop*, and think of the *father* whom we loved and feared not.'

In 1900 he was much consulted by Mrs. Ruspini with regard to the rules of a new order of rescue workers, which he named 'The Order of Divine Compassion,' and its members venerate his memory as their founder. His views about a community life are shown in the following letter :

'Fulham Palace : January 26, 1899.

'Dear Sir,—The object of the Christian endeavour is to lead a life devoted to God's service. How the individual can best do this is a matter which he has to settle with God's help. Community life is one mode of settling the question by the acceptance of a definite rule. But anyone who accepts it must accept it without the smallest doubt that it is the best thing *for him*.

'It cannot be said that obedience to another is in itself desirable. But it is obvious that it is necessary for a community.

'The object of entering a community is to simplify life by accepting limitations. But you must be sure that these limitations are such as will enable you to work better—i.e. more freely, more at your ease, because you have others to settle many things for you.

‘If you think that you would find this irksome, that it is not the way in which you could work best, then you ought not to decide to undertake the obligation.’

A specially troublesome part of his work was connected with the supervision of the Continental chaplaincies; all those in Northern Europe are under the bishop of London as diocesan. He was assisted in this work by Bishop Wilkinson as suffragan, but difficulties of all kinds were constantly referred to him, and caused much correspondence.

He was always a peacemaker, and much of his time and thought was given to composing differences and settling questions which, except for his intervention, might have had to come before a court of law. His *lég*al secretary, Mr. Harry Lee, writes :

‘His singularly lucid grasp of all business matters, and the ease with which he mastered legal details, often of a most complex kind, was, in one who had not in the strict sense of the word had a legal training, most striking. He established a kind of tribunal in the diocese in which he sat as judge, assisted sometimes by his chancellor, for the purpose of deciding disputes on all kinds of matters between the clergy and others of the diocese. These hearings were conducted on the strict lines of the law courts, the parties represented by solicitor and counsel, witnesses called, and evidence taken in the most formal fashion, and there is not the least doubt that in many cases disputes of a painful character were in this way judicially and satisfactorily settled without the scandal of publication in the law courts or newspapers, where they must otherwise have drifted; of course the hearing was in each case preceded by a formal submission of both parties to the Bishop’s decision, and an undertaking given that the matter should not be re-opened in the law courts. Apart from cases where legal forms were involved, one could not fail to be struck by the enormous fund of common sense and world-wisdom which the Bishop brought to bear upon the ordinary daily matters that were referred to him for decision.’

In 1899 he was called upon to judge a long-standing dispute between the pastor and the consistory of the French Reformed Church in London. This church had been founded in 1550, and the Bishop of London had certain powers over it as visitor. The points in question involved careful

consideration of the past history of the church, into the details of which the Bishop entered with the greatest care and patience.

Probably nothing was so exhausting both to mind and heart as the number of decisions which he had to give every day, sometimes on trivial matters, often on subjects of far-reaching importance to individuals and to the Church. His daily letters would bring before him the complaints of discontented parishioners, quarrels between clergy, between incumbents and curates, questions concerning promotions, the exchange of livings, the boundaries of parishes, criticisms from members of congregations on the sermons heard or the hymns sung in the service, marriage questions, matters concerning education, sisterhoods, fees; then there would come a letter from a working-man asking him to explain the first chapter of Genesis. It seemed often as if his work were concerned with the infinitely little, as if he came in contact only with the troublesome and the busybodies, so that neither time nor energy was left to consider really great questions, or to hearten those who were doing the real work of the diocese. Many of the best of his clergy felt that they could help him most by keeping out of his way, and avoiding writing to him or coming to see him. The following letters show how he dealt with some of the questions which were brought before him; but most difficulties were settled at interviews:

Memorandum on a complaint sent him that persons had been refused Communion in a certain church, because they would not make their confession previously.

‘ Fulham: March 2, 1897.

‘ I enclose a rescript which you may send Mr. — for transmission to the proper source.

‘ The grounds on which a clergyman may refuse Holy Communion to a parishioner are laid down in the rubric before the Communion Office. These grounds in each case require public notoriety of the offence for which the refusal is made.

‘ It is not in a clergyman’s power to use his duty of administering the Holy Communion as a means of enforcing his own ideas of ecclesiastical discipline. He may advise such form of preparation as he thinks best; he can enforce none; the exact method of preparation is left by the Church of England to the individual conscience.

'Refusal of Holy Communion is a judicial decision pronounced on the character of the person to whom it is refused. In each case the clergyman is bound to inform the Ordinary, who is the real judge. The power of the individual clergyman is merely suspensory, pending a proper decision.

'Any form of excommunication is a charge that the person excommunicated is a "notorious evil-liver." Such a charge can be brought before the cognisance of a civil court: if it cannot be fully proved, it is a libel.'

In answer to a question about the re-marriage of divorced persons.

'Fulham Palace: November 23, 1897.

'The advice which I always give in the case of re-marriage of a divorced person is this. Inasmuch as it is legal, in the case of the innocent person the Church leaves it to his or her conscience to decide. But the Church Service is drawn up for normal and not for abnormal cases. It is undesirable to use it in abnormal cases, to which it does not strictly apply. The civil contract should suffice.

'I admit that in this case the re-marriage of the guilty husband leaves the wife practically a widow. You might hold this view and regard her as such. But this would not be known generally, and all such marriages in church create comment.

'I can only lay down certain general principles—and leave the decision to your discretion with a fuller knowledge of the circumstances.'

To Dr. Wilkinson (Assistant Bishop in Northern and Central Europe),
about the relations of Anglicans with other Christian communities on the Continent.)

'January 23, 1897.

'My dear Bishop,—I will tell you briefly my views on the question you ask, which I admit is difficult without definite principles of interpretation.

'The Prayer Book and its services represent—they could not do otherwise—the normal procedure of the Church towards its own children. They set forth the ecclesiastical course of the Christian life. They do not contemplate the existence of nonconformists at home, or of other religious bodies abroad.

'The application of them in these cases is difficult. There are two main classes to be considered:

'(1) Those brought up as nonconformists, who wish to join the Church, but do not see the necessity for Confirmation.

‘(2) Those who for a time wish to use the Church Services without any present intention of joining her.

‘Your question, I take it, concerns this latter class.

‘The decision will depend on the place we make in ecclesiastical organisation for *Christian courtesy*. How ought we to recognise this undoubted virtue? Is it not the point from which we ought to start in working for union? It seems to me that our relations to the Eastern and the Western Church are different owing to their different attitudes on this point. The Roman Church is discourteous: the Greek Church is courteous. We are freer and broader than either, and can go further. An Anglican wishes to communicate, without ceasing to be an Anglican, with either East or West. He sees no insuperable difficulties in the way. He practically asks that the settlement of his own ecclesiastical position be left to himself, but that it be courteously recognised by other bodies, without any departure on their side from their own basis. This is the first step towards reunion. Now are we to ask and not give? We have never declared against Lutherans and Presbyterians. Their system differs from ours, and we do not agree with it. But if a Lutheran or a Presbyterian is in a position where he can only attend our services, where he does so and where he wishes to be a communicant, I am in favour of admitting him as a *matter of courtesy*. We are not responsible for him, but we may allow him to use our services on his own responsibility. This does not affect our discipline to our own people—and does not come under the Rubric at all. It is an exceptional case which altered circumstances have created.

‘I may say that this was the opinion of the late Archbishop,¹ with whom I talked on this subject. I should be very glad if you could take the same view, as I believe that the establishment of this principle would be a real help in our dealings with other Communion.

On the same subject

‘May 20, 1899.’

‘It is a question of Christian courtesy, and has to be decided by consideration of the position of the Church of England. We are not a proselytising body: we do not claim that salvation is only possible within our system. We have our system and our discipline for our own people. The question is, Do we stand aloof from all others? This cannot

¹ Dr. Benson.

be settled by individual priests. It is a matter for the bishops. It has been frequently discussed by them. I have heard the opinion of Archbishop Benson and of the present Archbishop. They agreed—and so do I—that the Church of England may allow its services to be used by members of other communions at their own responsibility, as a matter of Christian courtesy, not of right. There is no principle involved in this, except the principle of Christian charity. Let the Church of Rome disregard this in the supposed interest of its own organisation; but we will not be so foolish or so narrow as to follow their example. The clergy have no responsibility in the matter. Members of other Communion ask if they may use their ministrations, and use their altars; my answer is yes, they may do so at their own responsibility: you simply lend them your services. I take the responsibility of admitting them. This is a matter outside your discretion: it is my business, not yours. I give the same directions in England and outside England. It is not the function of the individual priest to define the position of the Church of England; it is the function of the Bishop.'

In answer to a request for permission to communicate a chronic sick person from the Altar on Sundays.

'Fulham Palace: June 3, 1897.

'If it is the case that the lady you mention desires it, and if you undertake to carry the elements to her, regarding her house as a portion of the church for that purpose, I think you might meet her wishes without any impropriety.

'I personally dislike these exceptional demands, but there is very early authority for this particular proceeding.'

To the Rev. T. Field, Warden of Radley College (in answer to a letter asking how boys from public schools who went up to London to work in the hospitals or in the Civil Service could be brought into closer touch with the clergy.)

'Fulham Palace: January 28, 1898.

'Dear Mr. Field,—I feel the importance of the subject on which you write. It has come before me in a way which will strike schoolmasters as curious—a complaint, or rather an expression of a difficulty felt by many at the West End, at the impossibility of getting into touch with the boys of parents living in their parish. They tell me that school makes a hopeless break; they get the girls at Confirmation, but the increased importance given to Confirmations at schools has cut the boys more completely from them. I only mention this fact because I think schoolmasters should know how they have increased their responsibilities.

‘As regards boys coming from school direct to London, I scarcely know what are their chief pursuits. You mean those who do not live at home but follow some profession. In the medical schools there is a good deal going on, directed by chaplains and managed by the men themselves. A short time ago I addressed a guild at St. Mary’s Hospital, which numbered some eighty members, and was supported by the doctors. There is a Guild among the doctors themselves, the guild of St. Luke, which holds an annual service at St. Paul’s Cathedral.

‘Quite recently the Inns of Court have established a mission in Soho—which is a healthy sign of another profession. The men connected with the Eton Mission, the Marlborough Mission and others are natural people to whom to refer young men. They can go to look up their old school institutions quite naturally. The Oxford House and the Cambridge Mission, in Southwark, have many men connected with them who would be sympathetic. Such men as Gore, and the Bishop of Stepney, Scott Holland, and others are in touch with young men.

About evening Communions

‘Fulham Palace : February 14, 1898.

‘I am not responsible for several opinions which have been put into my mouth in an unauthorised way. But if you will take “deplorable” in the sense of “to be deplored,” it would represent my opinion about evening Communions.

‘The history of Holy Communion in the Early Church is rather obscure, as it is connected with the *Agape*, or an appointed evening meal. The Epistle to the Corinthians shows the disorders which arose in consequence. At the end of the first century, the *Agape* was separated from the Communion, which was then transferred to the early morning. This prevailed universally all over Christendom till about fifty years ago, when evening Communion was introduced by Dr. Hook.

‘I think this is to be deplored, because it made another question on which Christians can differ ; and I for one regard the introduction of a point of difference as the saddest thing of all.’

In answer to a question as to his motives in giving a licence to the Rev. Stewart Headlam.

‘Fulham Palace : February 16, 1898.

‘My dear Sir,—In giving a licence to the Rev. Stewart Headlam I had nothing before me except his present suit-

ability. It did not seem to me that his opinions on matters social and political were a bar to his preaching.

‘As to the question which you ask me, the drama is a very ancient form of art. Like other forms of art, it has changed at different times. There are two points to be considered at present: (1) the nature of the plays; (2) the conditions of the theatrical profession. There is a further point. If people wish to see popular amusements put on a right basis, ought they not to sympathise with, and help, efforts to amend the stage?’

‘I think that on these points everyone is responsible for forming his own opinion, and acting wisely and rightly upon the sense of his responsibilities.

‘I might refer you to a sermon of Bishop Lightfoot in a volume called *The Use and Abuse of the World*.’

To the Rev. J. F. Stern, minister of the East London Synagogue, who had written to him to ask him to use his influence to prevent the introduction of the new certificate of the Order of Foresters, because its Christian character was opposed to the undenominational character of the Order, and not agreeable to the Jewish members.

‘London House: April 30, 1898.

‘My dear Sir,—I agree with you in thinking that any form of certificate issued by the Foresters should be, if possible, free from any objection on sectarian grounds. But, while admitting the principle, it is hard to carry it into effect, if all reference to the religious forms in which ideas have been expressed in art is to be excluded. Art must have certain forms; and the forms must be dictated by general intelligibility. It is difficult to invent allegories which are intelligible in themselves. If they are invented, they are open to criticism at once. Yet no one can prescribe for another *what* conscientious scruples he may entertain. For my own part, my opinion would be this. Any artistic representation which rested on the *claims* of Christ would be distinctly Christian, and therefore to be avoided for general purposes. But references to particular forms in which moral truths, common to all, were expressed in Christ’s teaching, simply adopt allegorical modes of expression which are familiar to Christians and non-Christians alike. Christians may take them with any additional sanction which they choose to attach to them; non-Christians may take them as current expressions of truths which they themselves hold for their own merits.

‘The alternatives are: (1) allegories, which I have already said are difficult to make intelligible; (2) historical

representations, which are still more difficult ; (3) references to literature, e.g. scenes from Shakespeare, which would go still further afield.

‘You will see that I am discussing the matter from the point of possibility for artistic expression. I think that those who do not accept Christianity might still fairly take it as the only possible vehicle for the artistic representation of simple moral truths, without thereby having any strain on their conscience.’

‘London House : May 5, 1898.

‘Dear Sir,—In my letter to you I merely considered the new card of the Foresters in itself. The question of the substitution of it for one which is already in existence and raises no objections is another. It is always better in such a matter to make no change unless it is generally acceptable.’

To a clergyman who had asked his advice about attending a gathering to welcome a nonconformist minister to his new work.

‘Fulham Palace : June 19, 1898.

‘You have asked me a question which it is hard to answer satisfactorily. For one’s own guidance, one has to consider—not what one’s action means to oneself, but how it will be interpreted by others ; one has to strike a balance of the possible good and harm it may do ; and further one has to remember that it is impossible to distinguish oneself personally from oneself officially.

‘The answer which I would give would be that, if the welcome given to the new minister was social in its nature, and was held in a public hall, you would gladly attend to greet a neighbour ; but if it was of the nature of a religious service held in the chapel, your presence would be liable to misconstruction.

‘There is a common ground on which we can all meet ; but it must be neutral. Well-meant attempts to jumble us all up only lead to remonstrances, which do more to create ill-feeling than the premature display of a conciliatory temper creates good-feeling. If you went to a Presbyterian chapel, think of the letters which would be written in the newspapers.’

About the use of unfermented wine in the Holy Communion.

‘Fulham Palace : July 16, 1898.

‘The only point on which I feel it necessary to make any remark is on the administration of the Holy Communion in unfermented wine to some tee-totalers. I know the demand and I respect their scruples. But you will observe that the whole history of the Roman Church has been that of accom-

modation to popular demand—leading to an obscuring of truth in the long run. To change the elements which our Lord used is a very serious matter. It is an attempt to be better and wiser than He was. If once we depart from the plain words of Scripture, where are we?

‘I need not go on to point out that two chalices destroy the unity symbolised by the Sacrament. It is the excessive demand of the scruples of good men which have always been dangerous.’

‘Fulham Palace : July 21, 1898.

‘I have the greatest admiration for the ingenuity of the human mind. It is perfectly possible to prove anything we wish to prove. That is why it is necessary not only to specify the words of Scripture, but the method of their interpretation, which is the custom of the Church.

‘Now the rubric says “Bread and Wine” are to be placed on the “Table.” It cannot be seriously urged that these words mean “unfermented wine.” That is a phrase which has been invented recently for this purpose. The products of the vine are wine and vinegar. You say, “I have satisfied myself that the unfermented wine was the real juice of the grape.” I should be interested to know if you had submitted it to chemical analysis by an impartial expert. The only case I ever heard of yielded on analysis *no* grape juice, a good deal of gooseberry, some other elements which I have forgotten, and a good deal of alcohol.

‘But the important point involved is the danger of making two kinds of communicants, of recognising first and second class Christians, of destroying the Sacrament of unity, of destroying also the meaning of the symbolism of the Sacrament itself. For Bread and Wine together represent man’s nature; the bread is his physical ordinary nature; the wine his emotional and passionate nature. The latter can never be free from an *element of danger*: and the wine expresses that most necessary truth.

‘I could add many considerations of the same kind. The Church is desirous of keeping to the facts of the institution, of doing what our Lord did. It cannot do otherwise than recognise bread and wine as the material of the Sacrament. The wine may be diluted with water, for it was used diluted; and “the cup” differed from the bottle or jar because its contents were diluted. This dilution may be to any degree compatible with the preservation of wine as the material.

‘You will see that all our present difficulties arise from the pressure of excellent people to have their own views

satisfied. The result of everybody straining every point to gratify everyone else is to produce confusion. I can say no else.'

To Mr. W. G. Finch, who wrote asking whether in the cause of reunion, the Bishop would allow an interchange of pulpits in his diocese.

'September 30, 1898.

My dear Sir,—The proposal for an interchange of pulpits seems to me to be a step towards greater confusion. It is as if we proposed to be "At Home" in one another's houses, as a sign of neighbourly feeling.'

About the use of the wafer in Holy Communion.

'Fulham Palace : December 6, 1898.

'I make no order; but my personal opinion is that the wafer destroys the symbolism of the Sacrament, which is that we are all members of one body, portions of one loaf; *εἰς ἅπρος*, as St. Paul puts it. This is put prominently forward by the Eastern Church, where the cutting of the loaf is an initial ceremony, and each slice commemorates some part of the Church. To obliterate this poetry by a substitution of the mechanical and outward conception of the Western Church, founded on mere convenience, seems to me a very great mistake.'

In answer to a request from a clergyman for advice how to deal with some non-conformists who had attached themselves to his congregation.

'Fulham Palace : January 24, 1899.

'The question that you ask presents difficulties, and I have always tried to meet them on as broad a line as possible. We must recognise that the rubric at the end of the Confirmation Service deals with the normal case of a baptized member of the Church of England. When members of other bodies attend our services and are gradually drawn towards them, they are not unnaturally unwilling to be confirmed, because they have already passed through a similar service, and shrink from anything which might seem to cast a slur upon their spiritual past, and to separate them from their friends.

'I think that in such cases they may be regarded as fit for Confirmation in spiritual knowledge, and may therefore be admitted to Communion. But I think you should from time to time point out to them that their position is irregular and yours also, and you should ask them to remove this irregularity by recognising the advantages to be obtained by a full acceptance of the system of the Church, and by a loyal

membership of it. I have always found that this advice prevails in a little time.'

The clergyman to whom this letter was sent writes, 'Its contents have won several nonconformists for Confirmation.'

In answer to a proposal to discuss preaching at the Diocesan Conference.

To the Rev. Canon Ainger (Master of the Temple)

'London House : March 15, 1899.

'Dear Ainger,—Nash has sent me your letter. I think the subject of sermons is a very desirable one to bring before the attention of the clergy. Procedure by resolution doubtless seems absurd, but it is our rule.

'A resolution framed "That more attention ought to be paid to preaching, especially in the direction of, &c." would not be merely a truism. It would indicate that a revival of interest was a necessary step, and would be a practical recommendation. You might treat it as lightly as possible ; but the decay of preaching and the need of its reinstalment as a conscious object of pursuit seems to me to raise a question.

'Many hold that parochial activity and slipshod sermons is the right thing.'

To a clergyman who asked whether there was any objection to his speaking at a temperance meeting to be held in a nonconformist chapel

'Fulham Palace : December 16, 1890.

'It always seems to me that a temperance meeting is a temperance meeting wherever it is held. If a nonconformist chapel is lent for the purpose, I do not see that that affects the matter. But a great many people seem to think that it does. I am often in receipt of letters protesting that some London clergyman has been in a nonconformist chapel. I inquire, and find that it was at some general meeting, frequently for temperance, and I answer that he may go to any meeting that he likes.

'You will be able to decide for yourself if your presence is likely to give offence to your own people.'

CHAPTER IX

RITUAL DIFFICULTIES

WHEN Dr. Creighton first came to London there was some uncertainty about his views on ritual questions. It was known that he wore a cope and mitre, and in January 1897, five Evangelical clergy had signed a petition to him, asking him not to introduce the use of the mitre in London. But, in London as in Peterborough, he wore cope and mitre in his Cathedral on great occasions, though he was careful not to do so elsewhere in places where it might give offence. At one of his first Confirmations, the parish priest wrote to his chaplain asking whether he would confirm in cope and mitre. The chaplain was instructed to answer that the Bishop never brought a mitre to a Confirmation, but would wear one if it were provided, and this remained his practice.

To a correspondent who had asked him certain questions as to the use of a cope he wrote :

‘Fulham Palace : October 18, 1898.

‘A cope is not a distinctly episcopal dress ; it is not even clerical, but may be worn by choirmen. The position of the matter in the Church of England is this : the Rubric of the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. prescribed a cope for Holy Communion and for a bishop at all times. The advertisements of Queen Elizabeth and the canon of 1603 prescribed it for cathedral and collegiate churches. The question is, did they exclude it from other places ? And what was the effect of re-enacting the Rubric of the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. at the revision in 1662 ? I prefer to deal with such matters on the ground of common sense.’

‘Fulham Palace : October 22, 1898.

‘. . . A cope is simply an ornamental dress ; its original name was *pluviale*—i.e. a mackintosh. It is simply an ecclesiastical cloak. It is not a distinctly eucharistic vestment.



Photo. Russell & Son.

Walter H. Russell.

Notat 54.

It has no significance in itself. At present my work is to cut down ceremonies which go beyond the doctrines of the Church of England, and tend to put a meaning in her services which they have not. To do this wisely I must draw a line of distinction between things which cannot be, and things which are, matters of opinion. A cope is a matter of indifference, and I do not wish to disturb a congregation on this point.'

His taste led him to like a dignified service, but he could not bear anything fussy or elaborate. On first coming to London, he was twice unexpectedly censured at a service. When a member of Parliament wrote to remonstrate with him for submitting to such a thing, he answered :

' I visit a great number of churches in the course of the year, and I do not undertake to regulate the details of the service beforehand. It has been my habit to take it as arranged by the incumbent. I did not expect when I went to — that the ceremonial would be what it was. But I could not well interfere with the conduct of the service when it had begun. I perceive from your letter and inquiry that I must guard in the future against the possibility of my presence at such ceremonial being construed into my sanction of it.'

Again on the same subject he wrote : ' Frankly I disliked it, and thought that it would never do in England on æsthetic grounds. The Italian waves his censer in a nice slovenly way which is all right ; but the pomp and self-consciousness of the English acolyte seemed to me artistically offensive. The Englishman is no good for that purpose. He takes himself too seriously whatever he does.'

It is probable that he was expected to be more in sympathy with the extreme High Church party than proved to be the case. The real point at issue between him and them was that he thought that in their zeal for what they called the Catholic Church, they lost sight of the real meaning of the Church of England. He believed that the Catholic Church must consist of national churches each with their different characteristics, but that these external differences need not stand in the way of spiritual union. The way in which the Catholic Church had become a sort of catch-word was distasteful to him, and he said, half in irony, half

in chaff, one day to an ardent High Church friend, 'The Catholic Church must go into the waste-paper basket.' To some it seemed 'that he overdid the appeal which he felt so deeply to the great English tradition,' and a remark once made by him when speaking at a public meeting about disestablishment, that 'he was an Englishman first and a Churchman afterwards,'¹ was misunderstood and gave some offence. The religious life of the nation, the belief of England in its mission : these were of paramount importance to him. Preaching at Willesden in October 1897, he said : 'The knowledge of God and of God's way has to lie at the very foundation of our national life. In walking in God's way lies not only the safety of the individual soul, but the very existence of a nation. All our efforts must rest upon that foundation.' He was conscious of the difference between his point of view and that of the extreme High Church party. 'They do not care for the Church of England,' he would say. To him 'the great note of the Church of England' was 'to teach the people of this country the Catholic faith with the directness and simplicity with which the faith was taught in primitive times.'² It was 'a Church fitted for free men, training them in knowledge and reverence alike :'³ a Church resting on an appeal to sound learning. His great object was to get men to see its meaning and its possibilities.

He knew enough about London to be prepared to find there the widest possible divergence in the method of conducting the services of the Church. One who knows London well says : 'He found the diocese in chaos. Temple worked like a horse himself and he let everyone else work in the way they liked. Every church had its own type of service ;' and another says, 'Dr. Temple knew that there were extreme men in the diocese who would not accept his ruling in matters of ritual, and he probably thought it better not to accentuate their resistance by the promulgation of precise rules. Some of these clergy were doing on lines of their own a great work, and Dr. Temple was unwilling to hamper that work by controversy about non-essentials.' Dr. Creighton felt that the

¹ Cf. pp. 82-3 as to what he meant by this.

² London Visitation Charge, *The Church and the Nation*, 316.

³ Presidential Address, London Church Congress.

let-alone policy had gone on too long, and every day he became more convinced that the difficulties of the situation largely came because extreme practices had been allowed to grow up and take root unchecked. He felt that these excessive divergencies must be restrained, but he had no wish to narrow the Church of England. Speaking in 1897 to his first diocesan conference, he said :

‘ I must tell you frankly that I rejoice in the breadth and width of the Church of England as it is ; I recognise the enormous advantages which every different school of thought contributes towards the general spread of those eternal principles of truth in which we are all interested . . . it is quite clear that no one set of opinions, no one form of divine service, no one particular way of presenting religious ideas, will universally prevail. . . . I think it my duty, as Bishop of this diocese to show my sympathy with all forms of service and all forms of religious zeal, which are loyally in accordance with the principles of the Church of England.’

When he learnt more of the confusion which prevailed, he tried as usual to go to the root of the matter to discover what were the definite principles which must be accepted by all who claimed to belong to the Church of England. He said : ‘ It is necessary that there should be a recognised type of the Anglican services, so that worshippers may not be confused by the multiplicity of variations. We must have a clear understanding about the limits of permissible variation.’¹

But the task which he had before him was from the first complicated by interference from outside. The Bishop’s hope was to deal with his clergy individually by fatherly advice and persuasion, to gain their confidence and to convince them of the necessity of some sacrifices being made for the good of the whole Church. The noisy and offensive agitation organised by Mr. Kensit and his allies, and the ultra-Protestant and Erastian attack led by Sir William Harcourt in the newspapers, disconcerted his efforts. The clergy who might have yielded to their Bishop’s exhortations felt it difficult, if not impossible, to do so when their submission

¹ Address to the Ruridecanal Conferences, 1898. *The Church and the Nation*, 268.

might be interpreted to mean obedience to agitation. Everything tended to complicate the problem. The Bishop was not allowed much time to study it quietly, or to get to know his diocese, before the attention of the public was attracted by Mr. Kensit's interference with the services at St. Ethelburga's, Bishopsgate. The incumbent of this church had been allowed by Dr. Temple to be non-resident for many years, and the curate in charge, Mr. Phillips, had introduced services of an extreme type, much appreciated by the congregation. Towards the end of 1897 the Bishop had had communications with Mr. Phillips, and in obedience to his desire, the practice of reservation of the Blessed Sacrament was discontinued. The other services remained as before, and Mr. Kensit chose this church for a special attack. He qualified as a parishioner by taking rooms in the neighbourhood, and, after interrupting the services with irreverent expressions and unseemly behaviour, he sent an account of them to the Bishop, calling upon him for immediate interference, and saying that he and his party intended to communicate there on the following Sunday, January 16, 1898, when he hoped that the Communion would be duly administered by either the Bishop or the Archdeacon of London. He received the following reply :

‘Dear Sir,—I have no reason for supposing that you will find any hindrance to receiving the Holy Communion at St. Ethelburga's. But my advice to you is to attend a church in which the services suit you rather than a church in which they do not suit you.

This letter, which Mr. Kensit immediately sent to the press, was much criticised, but it expressed a serious conviction. The Bishop had no wish to enforce rigid conformity to one type of service, and in a large town where there are many churches, it seemed to him but common sense for a man to, refrain from deliberately seeking out a church where the services were conducted in a way of which he disapproved. Meanwhile Mr. Phillips said that he could not in conscience communicate Mr. Kensit. After an interview at which the Bishop pointed out to him that the rubrics gave him no legitimate ground for such a refusal, he said that he would obey a distinct command from the Bishop. This command

was given, but afterwards Mr. Phillips wrote saying that he could not bring himself to obey it. The Bishop then sent his chaplain to conduct the services at St. Ethelburga's on the following Sunday. Letters from clergy and laity in the diocese of London and elsewhere poured in upon him, remonstrating with him for the line that he had taken. Mr. Phillips resigned, and Dr. Cobb, then secretary of the English Church Union, undertook the care of St. Ethelburga's.

Dr. Cobb writes of the situation :

‘Where both sides had put themselves in the wrong, it was not easy for the Bishop to hold the scales evenly. What struck me most about him in the many interviews I was privileged to have, was the extraordinary solidity of his judgment, and his indifference to criticisms. His own mind was perfectly clear as to what the mind of the Church of England was, and what the then distress required. He corrected both parties with something of the serene strength of an impersonal fate, and of course incurred the hostility of both. Yet no man was less open to the charge of being a Gallio. His famous piece of advice to the protesters to go to some church where they could feel more at home was the advice of the statesman and received a prophet's reward. What rendered him a sphinx to zealots was the perfect balance of his mind, reflecting as it did the studied moderation of the Church of England. Not understanding this, the one party accused him of ignorance of what Catholicism involved, his only fault really being that he knew only too well ; while the other party insisted, in language more forcible than proper, that he was playing into the hands of Rome. In the midst of the turmoil he was the still, strong man who went his own way because he knew it to be the right way, no man making him afraid.

‘I can never be too grateful for the fatherly kindness he showed me all through the weary months of struggle. At first he seemed doubtful whether I might not emulate the prowess of those who had by their rashness brought the Protestant hornet nest about their ears. But once satisfied on that point, he gave me his complete trust. He approved the general lines of conduct of what was a sort of war, and for the rest gave me a perfectly free hand. When advice was wanted he gave it freely, and it was always advice which allowed for all the pertinent facts. The swiftness, too, with which he saw all the salient points, and then came to a

decision, was remarkable. The reason was that he had a clear view of what was to be aimed at, viz. a fundamental union of all Christians on the basis of allegiance to their Lord, with the greatest possible latitude in the expression of spiritual life.'

Mr. Kensit, of course, was not satisfied with Dr. Cobb, and continued his exhortations to the Bishop to do his duty, and his threats of interference. The parishioners of St. Ethelburga's wrote deploring the loss of the curate, whose ministrations they had much valued. There were loud expressions of indignation in the press, angry remonstrances in private at Mr. Kensit's methods, and threats of a large secession to Rome if he were not suppressed, accompanied by the usual outcry that something must be done. The Bishop continued his efforts to take a calm view of the situation, and to act with a view to future peace, rather than with an eye only to the present emergency. He wrote 'We are all agreed in regretting that there should be such a person as Mr. Kensit ; but the question how best to deal with him is a purely practical one.'

His difficulty in dealing severely with Mr. Kensit's conduct at St. Ethelburga's had been that he was not clear whether the law against brawling in church applied to 'interruption of services not recognised by the religious body concerned.' 'It is not a question of the mode in which the Communion Service is performed which will raise any difficulty, but of unauthorised additions and of other services which have been introduced without authority. Much as I desire to keep the peace, it is difficult to avoid this issue ;' and again : 'Mr. Kensit on examination would accept the phraseology of the Prayer Book respecting the Sacraments, and would say that his objection was to adjuncts to the service not prescribed in the Prayer Book. . . . The wise thing to do is to put him steadily in the wrong.' When Dr. Cobb took charge, and discontinued such practices as the Bishop judged decidedly illegal at St. Ethelburga's, the Bishop could support him in a way in which he had not felt able to support Mr. Phillips. Still Mr. Kensit continued to pelt him 'with representations against Dr. Cobb's method of celebrating.' He had begun by trying to treat Mr. Kensit as a reasonable man, but early in 1898

was obliged to tell his chaplain to say that, as Mr. Kensit published his private letters to him, he could hold no further communication with him. Finally he answered the continued complaints of Mr. Kensit and his two allies :

‘ March 2, 1898.

‘ Gentlemen,—In answer to your communication of the 25th ult., I have to say that it is impossible for me to regulate the minute details of public worship in all the churches in this diocese ; and it would be undesirable for me to attempt to do so. Something must always be left to the discretion of the officiating minister and to the wishes of the congregation.

‘ The services as now conducted at St. Ethelburga’s are those prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer. If in some points of detail they are not entirely in accordance with your personal preference, I can only repeat the advice which I originally gave, that you should seek some neighbouring church where you may be better satisfied.

‘ I would remind you that there is a congregation at St. Ethelburga’s whose wishes deserve my consideration as much as yours. I am not prepared to interfere with Dr. Cobb’s discretion in the conduct of the services.’

Another violent interruption of a service, this time at St. Cuthbert’s, Philbeach Gardens, by Mr. Kensit and his friends, on Good Friday, increased the irritation on both sides, especially as the service disturbed was an unauthorised one. The Bishop was besieged with letters in which persons of the most opposite opinions in turn wrote to tell him, that they knew that thousands felt as they did, and that the Church was on the verge of ruin, and could only be saved by their particular advice being followed. There were not only remonstrances from the foolish and the fanatics, but from thoughtful lawyers and other serious men, scandalised at the open defiance of order and decency.

To one who wished to take steps to vindicate him from the attacks made on him, the Bishop answered :

‘ February 4, 1898.

‘ My dear Sir,—I am obliged to you for your letter and its offer. But I never wish to defend myself—and I prefer not to be defended. Very few people can see the justice of any cause, they can only judge from their own prejudices. I have another very strong reason. I am a father to all my

clergy. It is my duty to bear the burden of their mistakes. I never make public what passed between them and me.'

To one of his clergy who wrote to assure him of his loyalty and devotion he answered

'London House: May 25, 1898.

'Thank you for your letter. It does one good to be cheered up sometimes. Please do not suppose that I have any grievance against the clergy: I only recognise their foible of excessive individualism. The difficulties of the clergy in this diocese are enormous: isolation, congregationalism, little intercourse with one another or the Bishop, little sense of the largeness of the Church as a whole, or of the end of its working. We must face our dangers by recognising their existence.'

Speaking to his diocesan conference on April 28, he explained what he was trying to do.

'My duty is to deal with my clergy straightforwardly and frankly, to deal with them in the spirit of kindness and in the spirit of Christian love, to deal with them by means of arguments, and not by attempting to coerce them or to bring pressure upon them to go in directions which are contrary to their own consciences. It is my duty to try to bring them all together equally into agreement upon the great fundamental points of our Christian practice, because in matters of Christian faith, of course, we are not divided. We are divided simply and solely upon matters whose importance—and I admit they are of importance—is very frequently overstated and over-estimated. It is my duty, a duty which I have constantly before me, and at no time more than at present, to try by personal persuasion and personal influence, by talking and conference with those who seem to be divided, to bring all together into an understanding at least of one another's position, that we may discover exactly what are the points upon which we differ; for until we have discovered those, any attempt at agreement is obviously quite impossible.'

To his conference he said no more about ritual troubles, but a few days afterwards he received at London House a deputation from the Church Association in support of Mr Kensit's action at St. Ethelburga's, which they described as 'a manly and constitutional protest' meriting the Bishop's approval; they called upon him to drive out all false and erroneous doctrines and illegal practices. The

Bishop's answer was, in the main, a plea for toleration within the Church. He said :

‘ People in England are agreed as they never were before about the fundamental doctrines of Christian faith. True religion prevails in England to-day as an actual power on the individual and society, and it should be recognised that it is desirable in minor matters, such as the mode of public worship—for I consider that those are minor matters which are not concerned with the fundamental truths of the Christian faith, but with the manner in which it is thought desirable to put forth those truths in public worship—toleration should be practised. . . . I think that some things are done which are contrary to the large liberty allowed in the Church. There are certain lines to be maintained, but the drawing of these lines is always a very difficult thing. On that point the minds of the bishops are frequently exercised, and they struggle as much as they can to bring their influence to bear upon those who make use of illegal practices.

‘ Englishmen never like to see people dealt with in a legal manner in consequence of their opinions. The bishops have come to the conclusion that a prosecution does more harm than good ; that, so far from putting down practices, it only gives them increased vitality . . . The most deplorable periods in the history of the Church of England have been when attempts were made to enforce uniformity of worship. The belief in the possibility of enforcing upon a free people uniform forms and ideas has been a great evil to the Church. . . . It would be well for us now to try and understand one another, so that we may see the points upon which we disagree, and, when we have discovered them, bring them into the quiet and calm region where they may be dealt with in the manner of Christian liberty and charity. My own desire and my intention is to go on reasoning with those whom I think to be behaving foolishly, trying to understand their position, and to discover how they can be brought to greater union and, what is more desirable, to the principle of law and order. Speaking for myself, I can only say that Mr. Kensit's action has thrown very great hindrances in my course. I was going on quietly and gently, struggling to bring about a greater agreement between the different parties in the Church. Mr. Kensit has precipitated hostilities, and is marshalling people into hostile camps. I must pursue the course upon which I have entered, and I hope to have the co-operation of the Church Association. . . . You must remember that round these trifling matters of ritual there

gathers a mass of sentiment and feeling which is intimately associated with the facts of human life. . . . In early times great difficulties beset the Church of England because the bishops were regarded as policemen. A bishop has two jurisdictions—the paternal and the judicial, but his judicial functions are distinctly second to his paternal.’

The deputation expressed themselves as somewhat disappointed at the Bishop’s remarks, and the press spoke of the ‘airy way’ in which he spoke about the matter and ‘the contemptuous indifference’ with which he treated these storms. But these criticisms could not deter him from his quiet and steady policy. He had also at this time an interview with some of the more extreme ritualists in order to talk over the situation with them. Amongst other things he appears to have tried to persuade them to abstain from the use of words which must necessarily irritate. He wrote to one of them after the interview :

‘I do not know that I succeeded in getting you and your friends to see my point about the use of Roman terminology. Perhaps you will understand the larger bearing of my opinion by reading the enclosed, which has just been sent me by a Roman friend. It is written by the ablest of the English Romans (Dr. Barry) and is a plea to all the members of that Church to abandon the terminology of a belated philosophy, and to speak in accordance with the thought of the present day. Now if a Roman feels this, what must he think of us who are plunging into rubbish which he is trying to get rid of?’

He was increasingly convinced that nothing could be done to promote permanent peace until the irritation had subsided. When Mr. Kensit wrote asking him to present a petition to the Upper House of Convocation, he answered :

‘May 10, 1898.

Dear Sir,—I shall have much pleasure in presenting your petition to the Upper House of Convocation to-morrow.

‘I notice with satisfaction your assurance that public protests are painful to yourself. They are painful to very many others, and tend to create in their minds feelings which are contrary to a peaceful settlement.

‘It would greatly strengthen my hands in dealing with this very important matter if you would discontinue your protests at divine service, and would submit to me a memorial

stating objectionable practices and your reasons for objecting to them.'

In reply Mr. Kensit wrote undertaking that for the next two calendar months he would make no public protest in any church in the London diocese, and also promised that the arrangements made for protests in thirteen other dioceses would be suspended.

After the presentation of Mr. Kensit's petition the Archbishop first spoke, and testified to the increasing willingness shown by the clergy during the last few years to submit to the authority of the bishops. He felt some doubt how far a bishop ought to inquire for himself when he suspected illegal practices in a parish, or how far he should wait till they were brought before his notice, and said :

'Hitherto, I confess, that I have never interfered—that is, since the time when there was the general agreement not to prosecute—unless the matter has been regularly brought before me. I avoided making any distinct inquiry into separate cases. Sometimes, as you know, those who in this way step outside the proper limits of the Church are, nevertheless, such spiritual men, are so devoted to their work, are such examples of the deepest piety, and, in fact, do so much for the religious life of their people, that it is very difficult for a bishop to say "You ought not to do this" . . . to interfere, and by interfering to stop what is really religious work, and religious work sometimes of the very best kind.'

Dr. Creighton followed the Archbishop, and said that he was glad to have an opportunity of speaking on the general issue. Two movements were going on to remedy what had been discovered to be wrong, one a movement of reform from within, the other of violent protest from without, and his difficulty had been to prevent these movements from getting hopelessly into the way of one another.

'I discovered,' he continued, 'soon after coming to the diocese of London that there were certainly one or two features in the conduct of services in some churches which awakened natural anxiety . . . the introduction of unauthorised services and ceremonies in addition to those contained in the Book of Common Prayer . . . and, secondly, the additions to, or omissions from, the Communion Office contained in the Book

of Common Prayer, which seem to me to be made with a view of reading that service into the terms of the services of the Church of Rome. There is, thirdly, the needless use of Roman terminology in church notices, in parochial magazines, and also in the teaching given in some churches. Those three things seem to me to be opposed to the principles of the Church of England, and to need, if possible, some restriction. They are founded upon individual preference in a great many cases, and at the bottom of them lies a disregard of all authority, or, at all events, a curious mode of explaining what is the nature of authority. . . . I, found, further, that there was great uneasiness about these things existing in a very large body of the clergy themselves; in fact, existing almost universally among them. There was also a very considerable amount of anxiety and uneasiness among those whom, with perfect respect and entire sympathy with them, I would still call, simply for convenience, the offenders in these matters. For they frequently found that, though they started from what they supposed to be common principles, they came to different conclusions, and they were by no means at harmony amongst themselves. . . . I may say that, much as the matter has been brought before the public lately, the number of churches in which these things are done is comparatively small. . . . I found that there was a desire on the part of many clergy that some steps should be taken to consider more definitely what was the nature of authority in the Church of England, and how it could be most profitably exercised. Your lordships may have seen resolutions passed at a tolerably large, and in many ways a very representative, conference¹ which was held a few days ago. . . . The first resolution is "That this conference recognises the full authority of the bishop to prohibit any service not contained in the Book of Common Prayer." The second is "That this conference recognises the full authority of the bishop to prohibit any omissions from or any additions to the services contained in the Book of Common Prayer." The arrangements for the holding of that conference were begun last October, and I know of similar movements which were begun long before this public protest took any shape at all. Movements that are of great importance, and furthermore conferences which I have held myself with many of the clergy who might be called extreme, were going on. It was exceedingly inconvenient in all ways

¹ A conference convened by Canon Carter of Clewer and held in Osnaburgh Street on May 5.

that a peaceable solution of these questions should be hampered by any ill-advised utterances that were made with reference to public protests which had taken place, and I considered it my duty to abstain very carefully from saying anything which could in the least degree add to the exasperation of people's minds. . . . The laity are perplexed and disturbed . . . when any body of people disregard lawful authority altogether, and undertake to become a law to themselves, they certainly are shocking the Christian conscience in a way which far exceeds, in the gravity of the mischief which it is doing, any good that they can possibly do by attending, as they may think best, to the needs of the small flock which they have gathered around them. This feeling of the laity is also, if I interpret it aright, founded upon a very sane and wholesome dread of exotic usages, and the introduction of emotional appeals in divine services, which they feel to be a serious menace to the stability, the seriousness, and the straightforwardness of the English character. . . . I believe it is possible that by putting before the minds of the clergy broad considerations of the character and of the destiny of the English Church, it may be quite within our power to create, perhaps for the first time in the history of that Church, a unanimity of opinion and an understanding of the great work to which the providence of God has called us, which may make us strong for a fresh beginning in the annals of that Church which we all love so well.'

The Bishop discussed the situation with men of every variety of opinion, both singly and in conference, always trying to see with their eyes and to understand their point of view. Those who differed most from him were compelled to recognise his desire to act with fairness and sympathy. Their letters to him abound with remarks about his exceeding kindness, they speak of being 'deeply touched by the fatherly and sympathetic tone of your letter,' of 'the gentle kindness of your letter.' One about whose extreme practices there had been many complaints, and with whom the Bishop had in consequence constant correspondence and interviews, writes, 'In past times we have been perhaps driven into an undesirable attitude towards our bishops by having it forced upon us that our point of view was not understood and not appreciated. Now, thank God, that is in a great measure changed . . . I do feel that when one can come to a

Bishop of London and freely and fearlessly speak on such a matter as exposition, one may indeed be thankful for the change one has lived to see.'

The Bishop's consideration of the problem led him to decide that the first thing to do was to try to check the deviations from the services prescribed in the Prayer Book. He wrote :

'Some of these introduce doctrines not contained in the Prayer Book, e.g. Benediction, Rosary of the Virgin, Litany of the Saints, Services for the Dead, which incorporate the Romish view of Purgatory. This is serious—the most serious thing which is at the bottom of the present discontent. It upsets the type of service altogether; it disregards all the principles of the Church of England; it ostentatiously declares that the Church of England is an imperfect system, to be supplemented at each man's option from any source he thinks fit . . . with this the bishops can and ought to deal directly; it is a matter of doctrine.'

In June he issued the following letter to his clergy :

'Fulham Palace : June 14, 1898.

'Rev. and dear Sir,—There are some points relating to the performance of divine service to which I think it is well to direct the attention of the clergy.

'In a diocese such as this, where there is so much work to be done of a missionary character, and where the circumstances of parishes vary so greatly, it is natural that there should be a tendency to make new experiments in various ways. This natural tendency has affected the conduct of public worship, and must, in some degree, always do so. But it is a tendency which must be subject to certain obvious limitations, to which I would call your attention. It is absolutely necessary that nothing should be done which affects the due performance of the services of the Church as laid down in the Book of Common Prayer, and that any additional services which are used should conform entirely to the spirit and intention of the Prayer Book. There must be no confusion in the minds of the people as to the standard of worship in the Church of England, and there must be no opportunity for personal eccentricities to invade the system of the Church. No seeming advantage to the methods of teaching pursued by an individual teacher, as suited to a particular congregation, can compensate for the harm which is done to ecclesiastical order by any infringement of these principles.

‘For the guidance of the clergy I think it well to give a few directions on points which I know to have caused some perplexity and dissatisfaction.

‘(1) Morning and Evening Prayer should be said, and the Holy Communion be celebrated, on Sundays at such hours as are most convenient to the congregation. There should be no appearance of disregard of any one of these services in favour of another.

‘(2) The service for Holy Communion should be said as it is appointed in the Book of Common Prayer, without additions or omissions. It should be said in an audible voice throughout.

‘(3) Additional services, where used, should be separated by a distinct interval from the services appointed in the Prayer Book, and should be announced as additional.

‘(4) These additional services are, I am aware, for the most part of a very simple kind, consisting of Psalms, Lessons, and Prayers taken from the Prayer Book. They are adapted to special classes, such as services for children, or for men or women, or members of parochial guilds or organisations; or they are intercessions for special purposes, such as missions, or temperance, and the like. I need not say that I have no wish to restrict the use of the church for such purposes of devotion; but I think it right that in all cases such services should be submitted for my sanction.

‘In making known to you my wishes in these matters, I would express my deepest sympathy with the arduous work in which you are engaged, and with the difficulties which beset you in dealing with the many problems which it must needs raise in your minds. But it is my duty to see that permissible liberty be not unduly extended, so as to impair the distinctive characteristics of the services of our Church.

‘Commending you and your labours to the blessing of God,

‘I am, your faithful servant in Christ Jesus,

‘M. LONDON :’

To this letter eighty-nine of the clergy, including amongst them many of the most extreme, answered :

‘June 30, 1898.

‘My Lord,—We desire to assure your Lordship of our dutiful and loyal compliance with the directions contained in your Lordship’s circular, and at the same time, having regard to the nature of those directions, to thank your Lordship for having vindicated the character of your clergy as priests and

gentlemen from the aspersions cast upon them by some members of Parliament.'

He received besides many letters promising obedience. 'I shall carry out your wishes in every particular.' 'If there is anything in my services not approved of, I will alter it.'

During the next months he received and revised the lists of occasional services. It was, as he said, a gigantic labour, but he found practically no opposition to the directions he gave with regard to these services. His views on some points connected with them are given in the following letters :

To the Rev. Canon Melville (of Worcester)

'Fulham Palace, S.W. : June 28, 1898.

'Dear Melville,—I was delighted to get your letter and find that we are in complete agreement. A number of trivial matters have raised a great question, which must be faced. . . . A number of devout persons have gone on borrowing from other sources till they have obscured what has never been definitely settled since the Tractarian upheaval. The point is to get this clear. You will see that I am struggling on quietly in this direction.

To the Rev. H. E. Hall

'July 1, 1898.

'... I have nothing to say about the private prayers of the priest, except that they should not be so long as to interfere with the convenience of the congregation. Further, they ought to be said privately, i.e. not audibly. There is great resentment felt at what many people consider to be an attempt to read the English Communion Service into the Roman Mass by omissions and supplements. This, it is said, is done by muttering the whole service, so that the congregation does not know what is taken from the Prayer Book, and what from other sources. The service as prescribed in the Prayer Book should be said quite audibly, and the priest's prayers quite inaudibly. It is necessary that the same service should be said in all churches, and that members of the Church of England should not be at the mercy of an indiscriminate eclecticism. . . .

'You know that my wish is to maintain the widest possible liberty compatible with the existence of the Church of England as a distinct branch of the Catholic Church. Its position is defined in the Prayer Book: and the services there contained must not be resolved into other services even of a similar type.

To the Rev. Canon McCormick

‘Bettws-y-Coed : August 6, 1898.

‘Dear Canon McCormick,—I am much obliged to you for your letter. I feel that very much for the future of religion in England depends on the present crisis, and how it is settled. Of course, no crisis in England is ever settled by any definite action : but all depends on the *ideas* which spring from it and win their way to acceptance by their inherent power and truth. It is my duty to try to get behind the immediate forms of questions to their real meaning. This is an arduous task, and it continually occupies me.

‘First of all, the English Church must be the religious organ of the English people. The people need not all agree about details, but the general trend of the Church must be regulated by their wishes. The Church cannot go too far from the main ideas of the people. The present question is, Has it done so? or rather, have some of the clergy done so? They clearly have. Then how? I think on two points.

‘(1) They have disturbed a general type of service. No Church can exist without some universal type. Varieties may be considerable, but they must not disturb the *type*. The mischief is that the objectors do not know what to object to. They confuse things that are important with things that do not matter. They do not know enough to make good their position.

‘(2) The nation exists by virtue of a particular type of character. Character is largely founded on religion. There is in some quarters an attempt to bring back religious observances of an exotic kind which do menace English character. This is a very serious matter, but it is hard to discuss when minds are heated, and requires grave consideration.

‘I am trying steadily to bring these two points to the fore. In the shape in which I have stated them they are capable of discussion in terms which are not terms of party. They must be settled, and they can only be settled in one way. But the method is all-important. If the Church of England cannot keep together and discuss differences with charity, seeking only for truth—then a grave blow has been struck against the organisation of Christianity on a broad basis in a free land. We must remember that we are models for the future.

‘There is one point on which I would like to make a suggestion. You have a great influence, and I would like

you to think the matter over. The function of the Church of England is to be the Church of free men. Its misfortune is that it does not succeed in rising above historical accidents, so as to realise its own great heritage. Its enemy is the Church of Rome: but it ought not to treat its foe with fear, but with kindly regard. The Church of Rome is the Church of decadent peoples: it lives only on its past, and has no future. Borrowing from it may be silly, but it is not dangerous, and will pass. The Church of England has before it the conquest of the world. We can only succeed if we gird up our loins with the assurance that the future is ours.

‘The question of the future of the world is the existence of Anglo-Saxon civilisation on a religious basis. The Church of England means a great and growing power in America and in the Colonies. We cannot settle our own difficulties without an eye to all that they involve. On what we say and do, on our wisdom and charity at the present, depends a great issue. Let us see that the points for which we contend are fruitful for the future. I see a chance of much good emerging if we behave with wisdom.

‘I have written more than I intended: but you will forgive me. I only wish you to know how seriously I view my responsibility and how large I feel it to be.’

To Mr. W. J. Birkbeck

‘Bettws-y-Coed; August 6, 1898.

‘Dear Birkbeck,—It has always seemed to me that the Church of England recognises as strongly as possible the *fact* of the presence in the elements at Communion, but has declined to express any opinion on the *method*. . . . The expressions in the Greek Liturgy¹ would be quite in accord with the spirit of the Prayer Book. The theology of the English Church was best expressed by Queen Elizabeth:

Christ was the Word, and spake it:
He took the bread and brake it,
And what His Word did make it
That I believe and take it.

‘I think the only point to make is that we abstain from definition on points where Scripture does not lay down a foundation.’

To the Rev. E. H. Hall

‘Fulham Palace: October 12, 1898.

‘Dear Mr. Hall,—Thank you very much for your letter. I will try to answer it as plainly as possible.

¹ I.e. ‘changing (μεταβαλὼν) them by the Holy Spirit’ and ‘further I believe that this is Thy very Body, and this Thy very Blood.’

‘(1) Supplementary Epistles and Gospels. I found that the last Bishop had sanctioned them, and at first I rather reluctantly did likewise. At last I asked him about it, and he said, “I wish you to make known that I feel on consideration I was wrong in doing so. Archbishop Benson was of this opinion, and latterly I refused any additional sanction.” The reason simply is that an individual bishop cannot claim to permanently add to the Prayer Book for the stated services of the Church.

‘(2) Corpus Christi and All Souls’ Day. In the same way a bishop cannot add to the calendar on his individual authority, especially by re-introducing festivals which were abolished. They were removed because their titles implied doctrines which were unscriptural. . . .

‘(3) The term “Requiem Mass” implies a conception of the relation of the departed to God which is a pious opinion not revealed in Scripture. That there should be a special intention in the minds of the congregation is quite reasonable. But there is a further question, Ought this to be announced on notices? Is not that assuming a power of directing the congregation which is a hindrance to some? Would it not be better to use a form resembling that of asking the prayers of the congregation as for the sick? There is a difference between a suggestion and a notice which seems to exclude those who do not take it.

‘(4) I recognise the distinction between additional services and services for special organisations. In considering them I have to be careful about phraseology in the first, and about general intention in the second. But all services in church are public services, and must not contravene the principles of the Church. What these are I propose to discuss in my R. D. conferences. But I will now say briefly that one of them is to preserve the distinction between the faith and pious opinions. Pious opinions, however probable, and however reasonable, are reserved for private use. They are not condemned; they are only not incorporated into the system of the Faith.

‘(5) You will feel that we need not now discuss limits of concession. But I would point out that Beveridge speaks of *rites* which are different from *ceremonies*.

‘I mark my letter private because everything which I write seems to be published, in a way which almost destroys confidential communication.’

‘October 21, 1898.

‘I very much wish to have ecclesiastical matters raised above trivialities to a conception of the mind and intention

of the English Church—the noblest exhibition of Christianity, and therefore the most difficult to maintain. The present disquiet is due to an uneasy feeling that this is being frittered away into the forms of a mechanical system which, if it were to spread, would exercise a pernicious effect on the national character.

‘This is the large issue to be faced.’

Some of the clergy wrote to the Bishop asking him whether they could do anything to strengthen his hands in dealing with unauthorised services ; he answered :

‘Fulham Palace : November 22, 1898.

‘Dear Mr. Hassard,—I am obliged to you for your letter. I know that I can count on the cordial support of the great body of the clergy in the diocese. I do not, however, think that any expression of their opinion would be of any real service at present. The point is that we must all of us fall back on the Prayer Book, and try to understand it better. The more this can be urged the better. I think that the best thing which you and those who think with you can do is to urge the necessity of compliance with the necessary demand. It is a demand which I must steadily make, allowing as large liberty of interpretation as is consistent with the clear meaning of the services themselves.’

Mr. Suckling, of St. Alban's, Holborn, had said in the spring that he could not enter into the consideration of the modification of his services ‘until the intimidation of mob-law was at an end.’ When the Bishop wrote to him on November 10, ‘while sympathising with your unwillingness to seem to act under threats of disturbance from outside, I think that such threats are now abandoned,’ the list of St. Alban's services was at once sent.

To the Rev. R. A. J. Suckling

‘Fulham Palace : November 22, 1898.

‘My dear Mr. Suckling,—I have been looking through the occasional services which you sent me as being in use at St. Alban's, Holborn. They are for the most part of a widely different character from those which have been submitted to me from other churches in the diocese. They are not mere adaptations of Prayer Book services to special purposes, recognised in the Prayer Book, which may be emphasised in a brief form on special occasions for special classes of the

congregation. They are of the nature of a permanent supplement to the Book of Common Prayer, in many cases for purposes which are not there recognised at all. They include a series of antiphons in the Evening Psalms and Canticles; additions to the Communion Service by special collects, epistles, and gospels on Saints' Days, which are not provided for in the Prayer Book; a system of graduals and prayers on all holy days, and suchlike things which are not provided for in the Prayer Book, on the ground "that there was many times more business to find out what should be read than to read it when found out." . . . I am unable to sanction any of these things. And I think it best to tell you at once that, in my opinion, your occasional services are framed in a spirit of disregard of the intention of the Prayer Book, so as to suggest that they should be entirely recast, and that many of them should be discontinued.'

In reply Mr. Suckling wrote reminding the Bishop of the 'extraordinary circumstances' under which he had been instituted to his benefice at the request of Mr. Maconochie acting under the suggestion of Archbishop Tait and Bishop Jackson. He said that he was of course prepared to render canonical obedience to his Bishop, but that the reconstruction of services so widely appreciated would be 'an upheaval and a cause of much distress.' The Bishop answered:

' Fulham Palace: November 25, 1898.

' My dear Mr. Suckling,—I know that your present position was not of your seeking, and that your difficulties were not of your making—you will recognise that the same considerations apply also to myself.

' There are in the history of all institutions times when experiments are made, and times when the nature of those experiments has to be estimated.

' I am quite willing to accept your assurance that the services of St. Alban's are appreciated by the congregation. But the adoption of this appreciation as the sole criterion would rob the Church of any positive system and reduce it to congregationalism.

' It is now obvious that deviations from the services of the Prayer Book are tending to add private opinions to the system of the Church. It is equally obvious that such additions cannot be made by private judgment, or by the preferences of special congregations.

' It is with reference to this principle that I must review

your additional services. I sincerely hope that you and your people alike will be willing to make some sacrifice of their own desires to the good of the whole Church. I venture to think that this is a great opportunity.

‘If you are willing to talk over with me your services, I should be glad to see you and any members of your staff.’

The proposed interview was held. The services were discussed, and the Bishop pointed out the changes which he felt to be necessary. A few days afterwards Mr. Suckling wrote to him :

‘December 14, 1898.

‘I have to thank your Lordship for your great kindness to me at our interview on November 29 at Fulham Palace. It did its most blessed work, for which I am deeply grateful to you. Yet even now, I cannot hide the fact from myself that you have laid upon me a difficult task, though I shall try D. V. to do what I believe to be my duty.’

A circular was issued by the clergy of St. Alban's to the congregation stating the changes which had to be made. It said that, of course as Ordinary, it was entirely within the Bishop's rights to make these changes ; and ‘whatever it may cost us, it is entirely within our duty loyally to obey.’¹ There was naturally a good deal of indignation expressed publicly and privately. But one leading member of the congregation wrote to the Bishop : ‘I should like to express the deep gratitude that one feels for the kind and generous manner in which your Lordship has dealt with the church and the services that we love. I am afraid that some of us laymen, in our zeal, scarcely appreciate as we ought the difficulties of the position in which our Bishop is placed.’ It would be well if those who were loud in rebuking the ‘lawlessness of the clergy’ had tried to understand the real sacrifices made in this and other cases at the bidding of the Bishop, and in deference to what he urged to be for the good of the whole Church. This submission at St. Alban's was a very real help and comfort to him in the midst of all his difficulties.

¹ The services most criticised were the Requiem Masses, at which in future, in addition to the Prayer Book Communion Service, only a Collect from the Burial Service might be added. Asperges were done away with, graduals and antiphons cut out of Mattins and Evensong. The legend of Veronica was not to figure in the stations of the Cross. There were to be no proper services for Black-letter Saints' days.

But though his ruling was almost universally accepted, it cannot be said that all who obeyed were convinced, nor that the irritation caused by the changes quickly subsided. It was not only the High Church party who were affected. Some Low Churchmen had been accustomed to make omissions which the Bishop equally refused to authorise. He did his best to explain his policy.

To the Rev. W. E. Oliver, D.D.

‘ Fulham Palace, S.W. : December 9, 1898.

‘ Dear Dr. Oliver,—The difficulty of the present state of things is that there is great unrest, but great inability to state clearly what it is about. The general formula that “the Church is being Romanised” is vague; it may mean (1) that Roman doctrines, disavowed at the Reformation, are being taught:

‘(2) That Roman practices are being introduced into the services of the Church.

‘(3) That all ritual and ornaments are dangerous lest they should be Roman.

‘ You will observe that (1) and (2) apply to a very small number of cases. As regards (1) no evidence is ever produced of a tangible kind. I have never had any information of a sermon which preached Roman doctrine laid before me.

‘ As regards (2) it is invariably mixed with (3), and discussed with it. Everybody draws his own line, and no one regards principles. Yet till we have some agreement about principles, what are we to do?

‘ . . . You must remember that it would be quite easy for me at the present time to produce by an unguarded utterance (1) a considerable rebellion; (2) a schism; (3) a large secession to Rome. Would any of these help us?

‘ The proposals for a conference fall flat, because no one on the attacking side knows what he wishes to talk about. The fear is lest the extreme men be recognised by the great body of the High Church party as attacked for things which they hold to be vital. If that were done there would be disruption. To avoid that they must be isolated on distinct points. I have taken additional services as the important point; I am steadily bringing them into order. They are the real source of danger under (1); and that is the point to guard against.

‘ But it is necessary for us all to think out things more clearly.’

To the Rev. Canon Fleming 'Fulham Palace : December 24, 1898.

'Dear Canon Fleming,—One of your parishioners writes to me that at the 8.30 Celebration on Sundays the service begins with the Offertory sentences. A wish is expressed for the whole service to be read.

'I have had to rule that the service of Holy Communion is intended to be said in its entirety—that it does not come under the provisions of the Act of Uniformity Amendment Act, and that I have no power to sanction any curtailment of it.

'I know that a mere desire for brevity is your only motive, but in the case of this service it is the service for each who attends, and cannot be modified to suit the convenience of the clergy.'¹

In answer Canon Fleming wrote to ask what the Bishop meant by 'entirety.'

'Fulham Palace : January 10, 1899.

'My dear Canon Fleming,—I quite agree with you that I owe you an explanation of the principles on which I am acting. You will admit that, in a time of excitement, when many questions are raised in a confused manner, it is the first duty of an administrator to see that he acts with reference to principles. I did my best to define what I had before me and to pursue my object steadily.

'In my circular letter of June last I made several requests with a view of asserting the fundamental points of the system of the Church of England against all tendencies of our time which might in any way obscure them. One request was that the service for Holy Communion should be said "without additions or omissions." I was aware that this apparently simple request presented practical difficulties. Increased number of services, the needs of different classes of population, the variety of hours of service, the combination of services which congregations wish—all these lead to methods of abbreviation. It seemed to me that in dealing with these cases I must possess a principle. The only principle I could find was the clear conception of the nature of the structure of the service—its logical method.

¹ In another letter, in answer to a question whether when there was a Communion at 7 and another at 8, the Commandments might not be omitted at the earlier service, he said: 'I think that the Commandments ought to be said at every celebration of the Holy Communion. Such a service can never be regarded as "additional." It is *the* service for each communicant, and he ought to have it entire.'

‘Now, exhortations are not part of the structure of the service itself. They are instructions to the people, they are homilies or addresses, valuable as models of teaching, set forth for that purpose in a time when teaching was rarer than it is now. Their contents are now expressed in sermons. Their omission does not take from the meaning of the service.

‘But the service itself proceeds on a system which all hangs together. The Lord’s Prayer and the Prayer for Purity strike a keynote of preparedness of heart. The commandments insist on the duty of self-examination according to the moral law in its fulness. The Collect, Epistle and Gospel turn to the special lesson of the day. The Creed sets before the worshipper the fulness of the Christian faith. Then we turn to the special purpose of the service.

‘Can [any part of] this be omitted without serious loss? It is natural for the clergy who have many services to think so sometimes. But the service of Holy Communion in my opinion must be regarded from the point of view of the individual communicant. The method of his training is the one thing to be regarded. The rubric “Then shall this general confession be made in the name of all those who are minded to receive the Holy Communion,” assumes this previous preparation to have been made and ratified by each individual in the presence of the Church.

‘You will see the bearing of this on the subject of private confession. The first part of the Communion service seems to me to have been purposely framed for the end of setting forth the true means of self-examination and of quieting the conscience. To omit it seems to me to obscure or set aside an important part of the systematic teaching of the Church. This is the view on which I have acted. It is not beyond criticism, I am well aware. But the point on which a Bishop has to be even excessively careful is to see that the system of the Church be maintained in its great principles. In doing so he has many difficulties in dealing with the equity of each case : and in every instance he knows that he is regarded as needlessly pedantic. But I am of opinion that a careful consideration of the structure of our services and of their essential meaning will lead to a better understanding of the whole position. We must agree about the meaning of the services themselves before we can discuss the possible varieties of the modes of rendering them.’

It was inevitable that, in connexion with the revision of

occasional services, the question of the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament should come up. In the Bishop's opinion it was by far the most serious of the questions at issue.

To the Bishop of Stepney (Dr. Winnington-Ingram)

‘London House : May 20, 1898.

‘Dear Bishop,—It is clear that the Prayer Book contemplates the good of the sick person, and provides that he should have the satisfaction of a complete service, including Consecration, in his presence. Reservation in any form upsets this, and substitutes the convenience of the priest as the determining element in the case. This is the main point to be considered. The priest must not consider his own convenience till he is driven by absolute stress to do so. Of course population has vastly increased, and also the desire of sick persons for frequent Communion. If the demand is beyond the power of the staff to supply, then it may be permissible to carry the Sacrament to sick people after a Celebration in Church, if they request it, and have a complete Celebration at home when possible. But I think it should be remembered (1) that great Festivals have Octaves, and that the sick may be provided for during the Octave; (2) If this is not enough, the administration to the sick should be as far as possible a continuation of the service in church, and should follow upon it. My opinion is that the whole matter should be as rare as possible; that it should be regarded as an inevitable necessity, not part of a system; that there should be no definite reservation in church, but that it be a supplement outside to a service performed inside.

‘This is my own opinion on a reasonable survey of the case. The difficulty in applying it is that men are rarely reasonable, and if recognised as such hasten to become unreasonable.’

‘London House : May 25, 1898.

‘Dear Bishop,—We have just been discussing the question of reservation for the sick even within such limits as I laid down in my letter to you. I find that the Archbishop's opinion is strongly against any recognition of reservation on the ground, which I strongly feel, that the separation of the recipient from the act of Consecration is opposed to the spirit of the Prayer Book. I never feel that the case of necessity is made out : but if we sanction it in case of necessity, people are sure to go on. Therefore we will not sanction it in any form.’

To the Rev. R. Linklater

‘July 19, 1898.

‘The exhortation in the Communion Service is of the nature of a homily, and is at your discretion always. . . . The question of reservation for the sick is of great importance I know. But I can only ask you to consider the plain facts. The Prayer Book of 1549 allowed the Communion to be carried directly from church on days when there was a Celebration, to sick persons who gave notice. Otherwise the Consecration was to take place in their room as at present. There was no question of any general reservation in church for an emergency. This restricted form of reservation was struck out in 1552 and has never been restored. Moreover a rubric was added: “it shall never be carried out of the church.” I know the attempts to explain that away, but we must not try to explain away plain words, which have to be read in the light of the previous concession. It is impossible to avoid the conclusion that the intention was :

‘(1) That the recipient should be solely considered, and that the Consecration in his presence was thought a desirable part of the service ;

‘(2) That provision for exceptional cases was made by the rubric about spiritual Communion ;

‘(3) That the strong intention was to prevent the growth of a mechanical conception of the efficacy of the Sacraments.

‘I very seriously think that we must all accept these conclusions : and I am sure that our ministrations will be helped by so doing.’

‘July 26, 1898.

‘I cannot disguise from myself the real importance of the question of reservation. I admit the practical convenience of your custom : but I am certain that it was meant to be prohibited by the present rubrics. Of course those rubrics might be amended, and an effort for the purpose might be made in Convocation. But you know that no proposal to change them would pass any body representative of the Church of England, however elected.

‘The intention of our Church is :

‘(1) To seek the advantage of the sick person rather than the convenience of the priest. Many innovations have been made lately avowedly in the interest of the latter. This cannot stand.

‘(2) The sight of the Consecration is therefore regarded as an integral part of the service for the recipient’s good. Where this is not possible the recipient is referred to spiritual Communion.

‘(3) This was clearly regarded as a necessary bulwark against the mechanical view of the Sacrament which prevailed, and which is always a danger.

‘Now, of course, we may any of us criticise the wisdom of this. I confess that the more I have thought carefully about the matter lately, the wiser does the Prayer Book position seem to me. Deviations from it rapidly lead to excesses. Reservation for the sick has in several cases passed into reservation for adoration and so to Benediction. We have the proof that the line was wisely drawn.

‘It will take reflection to see all this in its various bearings. But if we chafe under the restrictions of our forefathers, let us remember the many blessings we have received.’

To the Hon. and Rev. James Adderley

‘Fulham Palace : December 24, 1898.

‘The chief principle regulating worship is the balance between the various elements of human nature. It is the very essence of zeal and enthusiasm that they destroy this balance through a certain impatience of God’s way. They tend to assume that man is what he is not—to forget his inevitable limitations—to assume that God’s purpose for our sanctification can be hurried on by assumptions of our own. The danger of this process is to assume that our emotions which are temporary can be made permanent by elevating their dictates above those of our intelligence, which is the most permanent part of our being. This is the root of the failure of all great religious movements.

‘Now reservation as a help to worship raises the question in a most acute form. Hence its importance. The reception of the Holy Communion is a moment of spiritual uplifting to the recipient. Reservation is an attempt, by outward appeal, to extend this over a longer time ; as carried out by the Church of Rome, it aims at making this moment permanent or renewable at pleasure. Is this possible ? Does it work ? Does it not impair the Sacrament itself, and those ordinary means of communion with our Lord which the Sacrament itself was meant to impress and strengthen ? This is a great question—to be faced as a whole—in its general bearing on Christian life. It cannot be settled by individual feeling or option.’

To the Rev. H. E. Hall

‘Fulham Palace : December 29, 1898.

‘My dear Mr. Hall,—The two points of reservation and incense raise widely different questions, and rest on different grounds. (1) Reservation raises theological questions which go very far. If practised for the purpose of adoration, it

is clearly against the mind of the Church of England. To prevent that possibility, the Church went to very early times for a mode of communicating the sick without reserving at all. It might have been possible to raise the question of altering this mode, on the ground that the danger which it proposed to guard against was past. But the misfortune is that that plea cannot be sustained. The plain fact is that the wisdom of the framers of the Prayer Book is amply justified. This has to be faced. No Bishop could say publicly that he believed reservation for the sick to be absolutely free from danger of any ulterior results. This being so, how can he claim to exercise any power of dispensing from the mode prescribed by the Prayer Book?

‘(2) Incense raises only the question of the interpretation of the Ornaments Rubric. I cannot see how any reasonable interpretation, which has the least chance of adoption, can go beyond the contention that the old ornaments were to be used so far as they could for the revised services, but the services must interpret the rubric, not *vice versa*. Incense might be used to dignify the service, as an accompaniment, not to emphasise particular parts of the service. This is the meaning of “censing persons and things.” It introduces an element not otherwise recognised—and so is in itself an addition to the service. These are considerations of principle: you will see that they are important. The point of the present crisis is that experiments have been made, and they are now challenged to show their meaning and their tendency. I know that it is hard to face the abstract question: but it must be considered quite in the abstract.’

In October Mr. Kensit wrote to say that if the Bishop did not interfere he would, and that there were hundreds ready to take the law into their own hands. He asked for a statement from the Bishop to be read at a great demonstration which he purposed to hold in Exeter Hall on October 25.

The following letter was sent him:

To Mr. John Kensit

‘ Fulham Palace: October 20, 1898.

‘ Sir,—It is my duty to see that the principles of the Church of England are duly maintained and expressed in the services held in her churches. This duty I steadily perform. When differences of opinion disturb the peace of the Church, it is the duty of those in authority to behave with strict regard to justice, and to remember that they are dealing with matters which are connected with the deepest sentiments

of the human heart and the most profound convictions of the human mind. Human wisdom as well as Christian charity prescribes tenderness and patience in dealing with conscientious convictions.

‘I regret that the tone of your letter implies that neither wisdom nor charity has any place in your consideration. You rejoice that you have people “under your command,” “who are prepared to take the law into their own hands.” Such a method of proceeding is doomed to failure, and I would ask you very seriously to consider the heavy responsibility which you take upon yourself by uttering such a threat. Excited feelings and disorderly proceedings cannot be the methods for establishing Christian truth. God’s message is brought to every soul by persuasion and not by force. Irregular and unwise action on the part of some of the clergy cannot be amended by more irregular and unwise action on the part of some of the laity.

‘As you ask me what steps I am taking, I would inform you that I am endeavouring by my private exhortations to deal with such irregularities or indiscreet action as are brought before my notice in such a shape that I can deal with them. It is only by steady perseverance in this course, that the principles of the Church of England can be vindicated and maintained.

‘I would be obliged if you would read this letter to the meeting of which you enclose me a notice. It is my appeal to the good sense and love of justice which characterise Englishmen and to the brotherly love of justice which ought to characterise the relations of all Christians towards one another, especially when slight differences arise between them.

‘Yours faithfully,

‘M. LONDON:’

This letter was read at the excited meeting in Exeter Hall over which Mr. Kensit presided, and was the only thing to which the audience listened. Mr. Kensit’s opponents copied his methods, and attended in large numbers to prevent his champions from being heard.

The Bishop chose as the subject of his addresses to the ruridecanal conferences in the autumn ‘the Position of the Church of England.’ By his words he lifted his audience, as one of them said, ‘into the serene atmosphere of great principles, expounded with perfect lucidity.’

He did not allude to recent controversies, but stated that his object was to set forth the principles of the Church of

England. He showed how the English Church had been reformed in the sixteenth century by returning to the principles of sound learning which England had the unique opportunity of applying calmly and dispassionately because there the Reformation movement was not inextricably mingled as in foreign countries with grave political disturbances; that the work which this learning had to do was to remove from the system of the Church a mass of accretions which had grown round it; man, to meet his own requirements, had expanded the Truth which God had made known. The problem set before the leaders of our Church in the sixteenth century was to disentangle essential truth from the mass of opinion that had gathered round it. The fact that our Church had avoided 'the method of continually attacking error by negative assertions without any adequate affirmations to take their place' but aimed 'at setting forth the Truth in a simple and dignified system' had led to the groundless assertion that it expresses a compromise: 'Sound learning must always wear the appearance of a compromise between ignorance and plausible hypothesis.' All things cannot be explained; 'where God has not spoken, man must keep silence. It is one duty of the Church to maintain the Divine reserve, and to uphold the Divine wisdom, against the specious demands of even the noblest forms of purely human emotion.' He concluded by saying that he thought 'that the system of the Church affords the best means for adding still more to our national character those qualities which it has ever striven to impart . . . the Church is a great witness to the continuity of national life, and the method of the Divine training of our race. It raises a constant protest against excessive self-assertion, against unbridled individualism. It forges no fetters; it knows no mechanical system; it does not impair the responsibility of the individual soul. . . . The great danger of the present day is lest the aspirations of the highest minds, profoundly Christian and profoundly moral, should desert all ecclesiastical systems . . . This gradual alienation . . . has occurred in other countries . . . we of the Church of England are still in close touch with the vigorous life of a great people.'¹

¹ Reprinted in *The Church and the Nation*, p. 266.

CHAPTER X

LONDON LIFE, 1898

I MUST return to consider some of the many other things besides the ritual difficulties with which the Bishop was occupied in 1898. He showed his interest in the work of the County Council by presenting in February the certificates to the 700 scholars selected by their Technical Education Board. The children were immensely pleased when he told them that, if he had his own way, he would abolish the teaching of grammar in schools. He was much amused at a letter from a schoolboy thanking him for what he had said about grammar, and saying that it had been the bane of his life.

To a schoolmaster who wrote to ask him if his words had been correctly reported, he answered :

‘ Fulham Palace : February 28, 1898.

‘ Dear Sir,—I have before me the words which I used concerning grammar. “ If I had my own way, I should abolish the teaching of grammar, not because I do not like it, but because I think it is the subject which is furthest off from life.”

‘ You will see that I was speaking from a general conception of the nature of education. Doubtless I am quite wrong : but I should like to see a radical change in our notion of elementary education.

‘ The mere point which you mention—that boys come from board schools knowing nothing of grammar—which they have been carefully taught—makes for my argument.

‘ You will not teach them to speak and write correctly by teaching grammar—but by making them talk and write and then correcting them.

‘ Moreover grammar cannot be taught from the English language. You may teach Greek grammar or Latin grammar, but not English. Even Greek and Latin grammar is not understood till the age of sixteen or seventeen.

‘It is possible to teach Logic, i.e. the analysis of *ideas*, but not grammar, which professes to be the analysis of *sentences*. In the study of every subject you have to allow for the length of time for which the course can be carried on. If a boy is going to be educated till eighteen, it does not matter that his knowledge should be in a very confused state at fourteen. But if his education ends at thirteen or fourteen, it is necessary that he should understand *then* why and what he was taught.

‘The conception of a “ladder” in education is quite wrong: it does not correspond to facts. If an education is to stop at twelve, it will be on one line *ab initio*: if it stop at fifteen on another. Anyone who determines to continue must go through a preparatory stage for his new work.

‘For elementary education the whole idea of a *subject* seems to me wrong.’

In March we went for the first time to live in London House.

To his nephew Basil

‘March 17, 1898.

‘Now that we are settled in London House I find that I quite like it. I get back in the evenings much sooner than I used to do, and I get out in the mornings without so much trouble. Also it is easier for people to come and see me. Of course we have no garden, but the children go to Fulham and play hockey as usual. I hope to get off this afternoon and have a game for a change. I am very busy with confirmations and see hosts of boys and girls every day. They all look very nice and good. I wonder if they will remain so, poor dears.’

To C. D.

‘London House: March 17, 1898.

‘You have been often in my mind lately, I do not exactly know why; but you are a very pleasant inmate. Every year as I grow older I feel more strongly the charm of old friends, and their special place in my life. . . . The more people I see, the more I look back on those whom I knew before. There is such a difference between knowing anyone in themselves, and as they appear in society—of course the last is interesting: but then to be interested is not entirely satisfying. However, I was interested the other day by being asked to meet Lord Dufferin at lunch. He and I were the only gentlemen, and we had a long talk. . . . It is interesting to see how conversance with great affairs affects a man.’

He was a good deal vexed about this time by the publication of a supposed 'Interview' with him in 'Goodwill.' It was written by a young man in whom he had been affectionately interested for many years, and was intended as warm praise, but it was not submitted to the Bishop before publication, and its tone gave offence to some. What hurt the Bishop was the breach of confidence.

To the editor of 'Goodwill.'

'London House: March 15, 1898.

'I am very sorry that there should be any misunderstanding. I had put the whole matter out of my mind, and would not have referred to it if you had not done so. But there seems to have been a complete divergence of opinion.

'When R—— said he was going to write an interview, I supposed that he meant an account of me, with a description of Fulham, and a few remarks about things in general. When he came I referred him to a book of newspaper cuttings which one of my daughters keeps. He asked me a question about Leicester strikes, which I negatived. Then he laid aside his pencil, and I supposed he had all the materials he needed. What followed was a conversation, which I considered to be private. I do not recognise it in the printed account, which seems to me to contain all the *obiter dicta* which I may conceivably have made during the last six years. But I never supposed it possible that anything which purported to express my opinions in words should be published without being sent me in proof . . . I am afraid that I know so little of modern journalism, and am so utterly out of sympathy with it, that I cannot even understand its methods, or suppose that any man with a serious purpose can use them. The appearance of the interview in "Goodwill" hopelessly bewildered me, and I am still unable to understand how it was possible. This is due to my ignorance of the world.

'I am really a very simple person. I like to trust people, and take them as they seem to be. The proposal for an interview came to me after I had professed Sister G——, while I was hastily eating my breakfast in your simple refectory. The idea that I was dealing with a journalist who wanted clever copy, and did not care how he got it, was miles from my thoughts. In talking with R—— I was thinking only of himself, of his dangers, of his tendency to exaggerate trifles, of the need of discipline. I was trying to give him warnings against worldly tendencies, which I see on all sides in this place.

‘I say this to explain why I spoke to you in what doubtless you considered a harsh manner. I had not personal feeling, I trust. But you have come out of the world; you are trying to heighten its standard; you are working for a nobler future. Beware, I affectionately implore you, of the ways of the world. We are always fighting God’s battle with the weapons of the flesh, and they break in our hands.

‘St. Francis did not regenerate the world by smart journalism. We all trust to our own cleverness: we all deal with modern problems. It is for you especially to rise above this—to deal with eternal problems, and show, not how well old forms can accord with modern ideas, but how spiritual power can create a purer atmosphere, in which there is neither new nor old, but all things become beautiful and clear.

‘This was what I wanted to imply—I am nothing, and this matter is forgotten. But you have a future: will you rise to it? The world will be moved by seeing a spirit not like its own; and this spirit must never work in the world’s way.

‘Yours with real concern,

‘M. LONDON:’

This year he took the Holy Week services in St. Paul’s Cathedral. He preached at mid-day on the characters of those who combined to condemn the Lord, to a large congregation chiefly of business men, and on Good Friday he took the Three Hours’ Service.¹

During the last few months he had suffered frequent pain, the cause of which could not be determined. So at Easter, by his doctor’s advice, we went to Glion for a fortnight. It was the only holiday that he did not thoroughly enjoy. He never cared much for Switzerland; the life in a big hotel bored him, and he was often suffering. But he returned decidedly better, for another month’s residence in London House.

One of his first engagements was to preach at the festival connected with the opening of the new buildings of St. Hilda’s, the ladies’ settlement started by Cheltenham College in East London. He spoke of the feeling that must lie at the bottom of all work for others. ‘Only in the sense of spiritual equality, of sharing the same gifts, can men meet on terms

¹ These addresses have been published under the title *Lessons from the Cross*.

of frankness and cordiality . . . Work done with the smallest sense of condescension in the heart is worthless. There must be reciprocity, the frank and full recognition that they who would teach others are also ready to be taught by them . . . What is the idea at the bottom of a settlement? Surely what each one seeks in coming and labouring there is simply an opportunity of crying to their brothers and sisters, "I beseech you be as I am, for I am as ye are. Is my life better than yours? If it be so in one sense, in other ways yours is better than mine . . . Let us bring all that we have together, and look at it with common eyes; let us not regard one another as separate and apart."

In the 'Westminster Gazette' about this time there was the following description of the Bishop's life: 'In the last eight days he has been at four public dinners, attended eight public meetings, consecrated a church, laid the stone of another, besides preaching, confirming, giving personal interviews to clergy, and writing endless letters. Well may Lord Salisbury say that he is the hardest-worked man in the country.' It was at one of these public dinners that he was given the freedom of the Clothworkers.

A Sunday spent at Cambridge in order to preach before the University came as a welcome break. He chose as the subject of his sermon 'Liberty.' Some years before at breakfast at Lambeth Palace, he had propounded the question what was the most important object of pursuit, and had maintained amidst the friendly and animated contradiction which never failed in that circle, that liberty was the most precious possession of man. This conviction only deepened as the years passed. But he felt also increasingly the tremendous responsibility of liberty, and said that, instead of snatching at it as a prize, it would be more true to speak of the burden of liberty. In this sermon at Cambridge he said: 'If we try to grasp the meaning of progress as it is shown in the history of the past, it is to be found only in the growing recognition of the dignity of man, which is another form of expressing human freedom, and is the ground of its claim.' He showed in his concluding words how that recrudescence of the spirit of persecution, which was such a constant cause of concern to him, could alone be met by a

true understanding of liberty. 'We have still to trust to the good sense of the community to restrain individual extravagances. But this good sense must rest upon principles; it cannot be picked up from the expediency of the moment. Justice and fairness of mind must rest on firm foundations, which are not moved by temporary storms. There are signs enough in all that is occurring around us of the duty which is incumbent on us to strengthen the foundations of our national life. We rest upon a precious heritage of liberty. God grant that we may understand its value and may use it well. But we shall not do so unless we recognise it as an eternal principle, capable of indefinite expansion, but requiring a recognition of individual limitations—a possession involving grave responsibilities, not to be enjoyed for personal gratification, or claimed for the gratification of personal interests. It is God's gift to those who grasp its meaning, and seek His help to use it rightly.'¹

On May 28 he was present at Mr. Gladstone's funeral, following immediately behind the coffin. At the last moment a wish was expressed for a prayer to be said before the coffin was taken from its resting place in Westminster Hall. The Bishop composed a prayer, which he said standing at the head of the coffin, just before the procession started.² That evening he went to Peterborough, for one of the very few visits he was able to pay to his old diocese. Always a warm friend of the co-operative movement, he had agreed to be President of the Co-operative Congress which met that year at Peterborough, and gave his presidential address on Whit Monday. He spoke about the educational value of co-operation. 'Co-operation teaches that no economic advantages are to be obtained, except by a corresponding responsibility being undertaken by him who hopes to obtain them. It shows that greater freedom is only to be won by subordination to a higher law, which takes into consideration larger elements of social welfare.' He pointed out in characteristic words the value of a conference :

'After all, the highest thing in which we can co-operate is in ideas. They luckily cost nothing, and do not even add to

¹ Published in *The Mind of St. Peter and other Sermons*.

² See Appendix I.

the weight of our luggage when we go away. Ideas are useful in proportion to the amount of our experience. . . . It is easy to improve society on paper, it is more difficult to improve ourselves in practice. Therefore I say to you cherish your ideal, keep before you your original principle, remember what your efforts have taught you, use what you have learnt for the good of others, do not try short cuts to prosperity.'¹

We went back to Fulham for the Trinity Ordination. In June he wrote to his niece : 'I am looking forward to August. I count the weeks with impatience. I always think that each week as it comes is going to be easier ; but it never is.'

He had been for some time occupied with a committee of Convocation on Divorce, and on July 7 he presented its report with the following speech :

' . . . It is extraordinary how complicated and difficult the consideration of this question is. It is a point upon which, perhaps more than any other, we feel the difference between the mediæval and modern mind. It would be almost true to say that all through the middle ages the tendency of men was to wish to have things clearly and logically put upon paper ; that they were more concerned in expressing lofty principles as such than they were concerned in carrying out those principles in action. At all events they were great idealists, and idealists in a different sense from that in which idealism exists at the present day. Nowadays we are all practical certainly to this extent, that our desire is that the laws should be carried out, and that they should represent what is the popular conscience at the time at which they are passed . . . attempts to take the letter of the mediæval law, and to infer from it that there was a corresponding practice, are very often exceedingly misleading. . . . It is not that the Church at any period whatever had any doubt that marriage was indissoluble . . . but it seems to me that there is no point upon which the Western Church displayed such incompetence, for I can call it by no other name, than in its dealing with the question of marriage. Marriage was a matter which was left entirely in the hands of the Church. Ultimately, as a matter of fact, the State had to interpose, because the Church had reduced matters to such extraordinary confusion . . . it is a matter of fact that the Church found exceeding difficulty, and showed exceeding reluctance, in defining what marriage was. Therefore, while it is perfectly true to say that a valid

¹ Published in *Thoughts on Education*.

marriage properly contracted was indissoluble, yet during the greater part of the middle ages it was almost impossible to say what a valid marriage was and how a valid marriage could be contracted. . . . This extraordinary complication of the marriage relation led to violent means for reforming and simplifying matters, but the complications were so great that it was impossible to simplify them in the way of putting them on a basis which was absolutely intelligible. The sixteenth century in England saw very great changes in the power of the Ecclesiastical Courts, and as the result of these changes, the mode by which matrimony was contracted which had never been regulated before, was now regulated by law. . . . With the disappearance of the uncertainty, the whole question of the possibility of the dissolution of marriage in the minds of everybody entered upon an entirely new phase, and has to be judged to a certain degree by an entirely different standard. With the existing position of the law your committee was not concerned. However much we may regret it, it is not in the power of members of this House to alter it . . . all we could do was to consider what advice was to be given to the conscience of Christian men and women as regards this important point. . . . We were distinctly of opinion that the marriage tie was such that, if it seemed to be severed in its outward appearance by the act of one of the parties, still the other ought conscientiously to regard himself as bound by it just in the same degree as if his partner had through a mental malady, been put under restraint. There would be still the possibility of recovery; there would be still the possibility of return; and considering the sacredness of the estate of holy matrimony, whatever might be possible from a technical or legal point of view, still there was the higher claim of the nature of the tie in itself. . . . But the Church of England does not undertake to impose upon the conscience of anybody a burden which is greater than he can bear, and your committee could only go on to say that: "If any Christian, conscientiously believing himself or herself permitted by our Lord's words to remarry, determine to do so, we recommend that then endeavour should be made to dissuade such person from seeking marriage with the rites of the Church, legal provision having been made for marriage by civil process. . . ." The marriage service is exceedingly unsuitable to be said a second time when there is a person still alive to whom the same pledges were made . . . no one contemplating the marriage service could conceive that it was composed with a view to

such a case. So far as that goes, we were speaking with reference to the conscience of the individual, and it seemed to us that that was all that we could deal with . . . our advice could only be given in our capacity as bishops speaking to the conscience of the faithful who are committed to our charge.'

Writing of this speech Dr. Randall Davidson (now Archbishop of Canterbury) says, 'he gave an almost new aspect to a familiar subject by the light he threw upon it from his wide and vivid knowledge of mediæval usages and rules.'

Previous letters show that the Bishop did not definitely forbid his clergy to use the marriage service in the case of the innocent party in a divorce case, but left it to their discretion.

On August 3 he was able to get off for the holiday to which he had been counting the days more eagerly than any schoolboy. He often said that the great advantage of living in London was that it made the delight of getting into the country so intense; certainly no man ever enjoyed his holidays more than he did. We went first with our children, his sister and his nephews and nieces to a house in the woods near Bettws-y-coed. Wales was almost entirely new ground to him, but he had soon thoroughly explored all the district within reach. After three weeks he and I went off to Italy, pausing first at Brieg, and then crossing the Simplon.

To his daughter Beatrice

'Domo d'Ossola : August 29, 1898.

' . . . On Saturday we boldly went for a long walk to the Bel Alp . . . we rose 4,900 feet, which is twice as much as Moel Siâbod. . . . The walk was very fine and the glacier and snow peaks were what people like, but I think them rather ugly. Of course it is very bracing, and the air is very good, and so on, but it does not please me. . . . It is quite splendidly Italian to-day. I hope it may remain so.'

To his son Cuthbert

'Bognanco : September 1, 1898.

'We are very comfortable. There are no English people, only middle-class Italians. . . . We prow about the mountains, and there could be no better place for studying them. It is a short and a narrow valley, and the road stops where we are, at a height of 2,200 feet; beyond that mule tracks lead straight up the hills. There are any number of steep lateral valleys,

and we wander round them. But the point of these mountains is that you never get to the top of anything. You go on mounting higher and higher, but there is always beyond you the main range of the Alps. Yesterday we took quite a mighty walk, and mother walks splendidly, if she is not hurried. We left at 8.45 A.M. and got back at 9.15 P.M. . . . The object of our walk was a series of little mountain lakes. First we climbed steep up to a little village, then to another. Then we struck the hillside . . . till we crossed the head of another valley. Then we had a steep zigzag to another village. Then in front of us was a sheer steep of rock up the sides of which we climbed, till suddenly we came upon a little lake lying in a pocket of the rock, which had three of them in different stages; it was very odd, and waterfalls dashed down from one to the other. Up here the cattle feed in the summer time on such grass as they can find, and I found a lonely cowboy watching them. They were quite tame; two cows made friends with me and followed me down to show me the easiest way. Sometimes they came and rubbed their heads on my shoulders and lowed with delight as they licked my hands. It was very nice; but oh, the paths are steep and one pants along. I do not think young folks would like it. There is no chance of tea—and one carries one's food in one's pocket. There is no hope for you if you wander from a path, and you can lose yourself hopelessly.'

It was interesting to watch how without any guide he soon got to understand a new mountain district. We often lost ourselves, but he was very cautious, and though sometimes we got into difficult places, he never did anything risky, and our walks never took us higher than to the edges of the glaciers. Even that was higher than he liked: he said that he did not care for the rubbish heaps of nature's workshops. He missed nothing on the walks; every flower was noticed; every child, every dog was spoken to; his enthusiasm was expressed in unmeasured language, and it was a family joke that every walk was the nicest he had ever taken and every view the most beautiful he had ever seen. And the exaggeration was almost a truth, for his feeling for nature grew stronger every day he lived. When we returned from the walk described in the last letter he exclaimed, 'Well, whatever happens nothing can ever rob us of this day.' On this journey, he started a new habit, and took to

composing verses as he walked. The following little poem was finished at Bognanco :

The merchant to his office wends,
The peasant drives his plough,
Yet here we sit and talk as friends,
Unbusy I and you.

The ploughman's muscles heave and strain,
The merchant knits his brow ;
All thought of care, all sense of pain,
Is far from me and you.

The peasant toils, the trader schemes,
Both human wants supply ;
But what avail our smiles and dreams,
Poor foolish you and I.

Ah, dear, the present needs we know,
But things are yet to be,
And who can say what fruit may grow
From love 'twixt you and me ?

The journey begun so delightfully was one of the happiest we ever had. For five weeks we wandered chiefly in high Italian valleys, spending three days on the top of Monte Motterone ; though he did not care much for the close neighbourhood of snow peaks, he never wearied of such a view as Motterone offers.

To C. D. 'Hotel Belvedere, Lanzo d'Intelvi : September 18, 1898.

'There are two things about the artist's life : first, the exercise of his craft stimulates his perceptive powers to a degree beyond his capacity for dealing with the results of his perceptions : hence he is constantly bubbling over in incomprehensible words. Secondly, artists of all sorts have an imperfect general education ; hence they do not know how to deal with their impressions. Everything one gets is ultimately dealt with in the terms of ordered thought, which gives a sense of relationship between one impression and another and an end which keeps them all together. Mere perception produces a tremendous fizz which dies away and leaves no result. Each new perception causes equal rapture for the time, and then disappears. This is exhausting to the perceiver. I believe that much of the malady of the present day comes from people not knowing how to deal with their impressions. There must be a scheme of things somewhere if we are to have any impressions at all—we cannot have

minds like lumber rooms. There must be some order. Yet the modern mind regards order as another form of tyranny. But Mr. — has led me into great questions. Let me return to my own perceptions of travel.

‘It is always well to have objects to pursue. I am now engaged in an intimate search into Italian valleys. As my holiday must be in September I am restricted to North Italy and tolerably high places—but I find that the valleys on the south side of the Alps will last my lifetime. They are quite lovely and are all different and all repay ample investigation. The charm is to stay in some place and go exploring without any particular object. You see a little place on the hill-side and say, “I will go there.” You start on a likely path, it curls round the hill-side and strikes inland and crosses the head of streams, and leads you far from where you meant to go : but it discloses all the hidden folds of the valley : the high meadow lands, the little villages, the places where the cows are browsing,—all sorts of mysteries—and you walk amid chestnut woods, by brawling streams and precipices and waterfalls, and see all sorts of things that the casual tourist knows not. We are now in one of them—such a lovely place. I dare say you have gone on a steamer down the Lake of Lugano and thought how splendid are the hills descending steep to the lake. We are on the top of one of them. On the terrace below the hotel we seem suspended above the lake. But inland is a lovely valley : there are meadows and towns on every side. We can climb a hill and look over all the country between Lugano and Como. On all sides you can wander in every diversity of country. It is this wonderful diversity which gives Italy its charm. I won’t bore you with an account of the places I have been to ; but if ever you want to explore Italian country life, apply to me, and I will tell you how to do it at any season of the year. I have not seen an English person, except one yesterday on a Como steamer. I go to places which the English know not. Even on the Lago Maggiore I stayed at an old-fashioned inn where we had a palatial room and were treated with all possible care, and for four days’ stay I paid the mighty bill of sixty-eight francs. Every night I sat in the Cortile, and talked with my landlady and her friends, and was quite happy. I am convinced that as one grows older it is necessary for success in life to find pleasure in simpler things. This is my experience, and I am glad to find that it is so.’

On our way home we stopped at Rheims, Laon and Amiens, that he might have a feast of architecture. He got home for

his ordination, and then went to Carlisle to be present at the unveiling of a memorial put up by the town to his brother.

The monument was unveiled by the Speaker (Mr. Gully), who spoke of the work done by Mr. Creighton for his city, and said that, remarkable though that was, his chief claim to the goodwill of his fellow-citizens was the spirit of ardent, intelligent, indefatigable, civic patriotism which he brought into his work, and with which he inspired all who worked with him. The Bishop, when asked to say a few words, spoke of the gratitude felt by his family at the recognition of his brother's services, and said 'Happy is the city that can inspire strong sentiments of local patriotism in its inhabitants; happy is the city which by its recognition of their labours can make that sentiment an imperishable possession.' On the base of the monument, a tall shaft surmounted by a figure of St. George, is engraved the message which James Creighton sent through his brother from his deathbed to his fellow-citizens.¹

This year our two eldest sons left Cambridge. The elder to go and study in France in preparation for a schoolmaster's life, the younger to study music in Frankfort. The Bishop had from their earliest days impressed upon his sons that they must choose a career for themselves. 'What do you mean to be?' was a question he constantly asked. When his second son, after beginning to study to be a doctor, because he knew how much that would please his father, decided that he could not go on, but must make singing his profession, his father first put before him very strongly what he considered the disadvantages of his choice, and then left him perfectly free to do as he liked.

To his son Walter

'February 10, 1898.

'Dearest Walter,—My only wish can be for your happiness. Your life is your own life, and you must decide about it. You may rest assured that I shall not be distressed by your decision. I was bound to put my opinions before you: and I know that you gave them your serious consideration; that is all that I have a right to ask. You have thought and you have decided. I can only accept your decision and help you to do what you want to do. But I want you to under-

¹ See p. 169.

stand that when I have accepted your decision, I do so entirely, and will never go back on the subject. Whatever you do, do it hard and well, and I shall be satisfied. You are a dear good boy, and I entirely trust you. Don't think any more of my objections. I should be very sorry to get into your way, or to add to your burdens. May you be happy.

'I suppose you had better pass as many examinations as you can. You might want to take your degree some day. Get on as far as you can. I suppose you had better get to singing as soon as possible. We will make all plans in the vacation. God bless you, my dear boy.

Something of his relations with his sons will be seen from the following words of his eldest son :

'My earliest recollections of my father are naturally of him as a playfellow, and children have seldom found in their father so ideal a playfellow as we did. Throughout his life he always loved and thoroughly understood children, and all children, especially his own of course, were always completely at their ease with him. There was in him none of that condescension to their level which children are so quick to notice, and which immediately arouses their suspicion. We felt that he played and romped with us because he himself enjoyed it, and not merely to amuse us. He seldom joined in regular games, and if we were engaged in any such, his entrance was the signal for us immediately to cease and clamour for a romp. And then there followed a romp such as children love, a *mêlée* of weird noises, unexpected activities, and a general appearance of violence that would have terrified a nervous mother. Description is impossible, but any child who has enjoyed a romp in which he participated knows what a romp is at its best.

'So it was that from the very first he won our confidence and affection, by making us feel that he understood us so completely. He would take us with him on his walks, at Embleton, when he went to visit fishermen at Newton and Craster; at Worcester and Peterborough on those delightful excursions into the country, which were his favourite recreation. In my case nothing fostered the sense of companionship so much as these walks and expeditions. As a child, his fun, his grotesque stories, his jokes, delighted me, and enlivened what otherwise my indolence would have prompted me to consider a dull constitutional. And when I grew old enough to accompany him on his longer expeditions, I was perhaps his most frequent companion. He

would say at breakfast, "It's a fine morning, Cuthbert; we'll take a walk. Where shall we go?" And then we would go off to the study to consult maps and time-tables, and "concoct a plan." As a rule the plan did not go further than a train out to one station in some unexplored locality, and a few trains back in the evening from various other stations. Other details were left to be decided by circumstances, the look of the country, or information extracted from the guide book, over which he would pore during the journey out. From these excursions I acquired an interest in ancient buildings, architecture, and history, an eye for a short cut, an instinct as to which cottage the church key was kept in (for I was always sent to fetch it), an appreciation of the country, and an enjoyment of a walk, which were simply the result of association with one full of interest and delight in everything he saw, and whose enjoyment was increased by sharing it with another. The way in which he took one into his confidence invited, almost compelled, one to share his interests, and made one feel that one's society really added to his enjoyment. All this caused a delightful feeling of companionship to grow up between us, and made me feel in a peculiar and personal way that he knew me and understood me, and even that I knew and understood him, that it was no effort to him to put himself in our place and become as one of us. Throughout his life I felt that he understood me as no one else did, that to impose upon him was impossible, that he knew alike the good and the bad in me, and that his estimate of my character and actions was invariably true and just. There may have been times when as a child I wished that his affection had in it more of the element of condoning forbearance which I noticed in other parents who tended to spoil their children. But it is impossible for me to express what I now feel that I owe to the fact that his love was based on absolute justice and unerring insight. A trivial reminiscence will illustrate what I mean. I remember once, as a child, being shut up in a room for some misconduct, and sitting there in a condition of rebellious obstinacy, trying to foster my sense of injury in spite of the reproaches of conscience. There was in the room a photograph of my father, and when this caught my eyes I seemed to see him looking at me with a stern reproachful look that penetrated into my heart, and, sweeping aside all the excuses I had been constructing for myself, made me realise my fault at once. And so it always was; the futility of excuses became obvious in his presence. With an almost merciless scorn and

sternness he would point out the folly and meanness of one's misdeeds, and the contrast they presented to the high aims and lofty ideal which he never failed to demand of those dear to him.

'This by itself would convey a false idea of him as a father. The exacting sternness which he showed on these occasions lay hidden at other times beneath his fund of tender sympathy and the affectionate interest with which he would enter into and talk to me about my boyish occupations and amusements, a sympathy which made it only the more bitter to have incurred his displeasure.

'Our religious education he chiefly entrusted to our mother; but in all our intercourse with him he made us feel the high standard which he demanded of us, and the high ideal at which our Christian profession required us to aim. There was none of that conventional talk about religion which is apt to seem so unreal to children, but an unquestioning assumption of its acceptance, and a persistent demand for the fulfilment of its obligations. The chief characteristic of his relationship with his children was the combination of sympathy and sternness which made us regard him both as our most delightful playfellow and companion, and also as our most exacting critic and our sternest judge.

'The other characteristic which strikes me especially, as I look back on my relations with him, and which marked, I think, his treatment of all those who came under his influence, is his respect for individual liberty, which showed itself in an aversion to exercise what is known as personal influence, and which made it his chief object to inculcate and encourage in others a realisation of their individuality and personal responsibility. "It's a free country." "Do as you please." "Don't if you would rather not." "That's a point which you must decide for yourself." All these phrases we recall as characteristic of him, and they indicate his deliberate attitude towards others, and a policy of treatment which I believe he consciously carried out towards us. He was convinced that each must learn from his own experience the folly of his ways, and that he had a certain right to be allowed to do so, and consequently he showed himself averse to interfering with our liberty of choice and action. He made it his object to develop the individuality of each one of us; he did not try to impress his views upon us, but to induce us to think for ourselves, and form our own opinions. He would talk with me when I was still a boy on questions that interested him, and problems which

puzzled him, as if I were one whose opinions were worth having.

‘But, in spite of this characteristic respect for the right of the individual to control his own actions and opinions and to buy his own experience, he did not in the least degree hold himself aloof or fail to make his authority felt when necessary. On certain small points, such as punctuality at prayers and meals, he was sternly insistent. Yet here again his method was characteristic of what I have tried to point out. He would say, “This house is a hotel, there are certain regulations which must be observed, and if you don’t wish to observe them you had better go somewhere else.” Similarly with regard to opinions: you were free to hold what opinions you liked, but so was he, and if you were more interested in trying to evade conclusions unpleasant to yourself which followed from the opinions he expressed, than in trying to understand them, and exerted yourself more to controvert his views blusteringly than to learn the truth of them, you brought upon yourself a scathing discomfiture. Yet his object was not repressive but educational. “A mustard plaster is the best educational instrument I know,” he more than once said to me. “It sets up irritation, and that impresses what you have to say, and then when the irritation has passed away, what you have said is thought over, and it is seen that there is something in it.” I realise now how much I learnt from him in this way, though at the time the unpleasantness of the process blinded me to its educational beneficence. Again, though you were free to choose your own course, he was also free to criticise. I think his criticism was often more effective than the most decided prohibition.

‘I have tried to indicate a relationship between us which continued to grow in intimacy from the time when as a child I regarded him as my most delightful playfellow, all through the time when as a boy I felt him to be both in the fullest sense my companion and also my severest critic, to the time when as a man I was beginning to find in him a friend such as none other could be, whose advice and help would be my guide in all difficulties, whose society was the most stimulating influence of my life, and whose sympathy and affection were my greatest blessing. I cannot recall that I was ever conscious of any necessity for a readjustment of our relations to one another; rather I seem to see marks of the tactful insight which enabled him to adapt his attitude towards me to my gradual development. There was never any break in the sense of companionship with him and in the complete

confidence which he knew how to inspire. His influence only increased as I grew more capable of appreciating its value and character.'

During the summer of this year the Bishop had given much thought to the question of religious education in elementary schools, and finally, with the Bishop of Rochester, had drawn up a letter to be circulated amongst the clergy and laity of the Church of England within the school-board district of London. This letter he hoped might form a basis for a common policy on the part of Church people. In it he said: 'Undenominational teaching rests upon an attempt, which cannot be ultimately satisfactory, to teach such religious truths as no Christian objects to. It is obvious that a fairer and juster plan would be to teach such religious truths as any body of Christians desired for their own children.' He tried to lift the matter out of the old controversies. 'Our desire is that the question should be regarded as an educational question apart from controversies which place other considerations before the welfare of the child, which is to us the sole object to be pursued.' His practical proposal was that 'the wishes of parents be consulted about the education of their children, and that every child in England should receive instruction in the religious beliefs of the denomination to which its parents belong.' He wished that the first steps in this direction should be taken by way of supplement to the existing system in the board schools, so that experiment might show how the practical difficulties could best be overcome, and 'the religious instruction at present given in board schools be disturbed as little as possible.'¹

He wanted church people to consider seriously the question of granting facilities for other religious teaching in their schools, and hoped that they would accept the principles he had laid down. But he wished discussion to be free, and would not be present at the meeting of the Voluntary Schools Union, where the Bishops' letter was to be considered.

To Mr. John J. Taylor (Secretary of the Voluntary Schools Union)

Fulham Palace: October 4, 1898.

'I think that your meeting will have to consider how far it is satisfied with the letter of the Bishop of Rochester and

¹ The whole letter is given in Appendix II.

myself. For this purpose it is not well that we should be present. Nor do I think that we should for some time say anything more on the subject. If you can organise churchmen on that basis, well and good : something may be done. But I venture to think that the policy there indicated should be accepted altogether—i.e. not only the practical conclusion, but the recognition of the existing state of things on which it is founded.'

' Fulham Palace : November 28, 1898.

' Dear Mr. Taylor,—The letter was addressed to churchmen in the London School Board district, and primarily concerns them. But many people feel that their action would affect the rest of England, and doubt about taking a step in advance which would at once be quoted as generally applicable. This is a question which I cannot settle for them. They must think it out. Can they hope to advance denominational education by trying to limit it to the Church? This is a matter of common sense.

' The letter, however, dealt with a policy for London. In London we may demand denominational facilities, without giving them, on the ground that we wish all to demand them in the board schools, and that these are accessible to all. We need not offer facilities at first till we know that they will be needed in our schools. If they are, we are prepared to grant them.'

' Fulham Palace : December 3, 1898.

' Dear Mr. Taylor,—When it comes to the point of action the policy of Churchmen always breaks down before the charge that they want to get everything and give nothing.

' I never concealed from myself the difficulty that a possible policy for London involved concessions all over the country. But I am sure that in country districts facilities would only be used very rarely, and then it would be the clergyman's fault.

' But it is inevitable that many will shrink from any step which might seem to give away the exclusive possession for religious purposes of country schools.

' I think that the question is most likely to be solved by rate aid universally.'

The following letters also bear on the education question :

To Mr. T. E. Horsfall

' Fulham Palace : January 3, 1898.

' Dear Mr. Horsfall,—I substantially agree with your views. They put the religious question as the basis of the educational question. This has always seemed to me the one

point to make—I believe that the Church, throughout this wearisome dispute, has been maintaining a true ideal of the nature of education. My great hope has been in the possibility of inducing right-minded nonconformists to see this. If the advocates of religious education would agree, we could do what we liked. The basis of agreement must be the right of the parent to have his child taught the religion which he wishes. I have always been in favour of this solution. I further think that an elastic curriculum adapted to local needs is necessary. I grieved over the wreckage of the Education Bill of '95, because it contained the outlines of a Local Authority. Without such an Authority we shall not advance.'

To the Rev. J. D. Carnegie (Congregational minister, Leicester)

'London House : April 5, 1898.

'My dear Mr. Carnegie,—You ask me a question which is perpetually before the mind of all workers for Christ. The fact is that we have the boys in hand during the school period, then we lose them, and have to pick them up again with difficulty.

'I do not want to go into controversial matters ; but I increasingly feel that, if the aim of secular education is to hand on a boy to continuation or technical classes, the aim of religious education ought to be to attach him definitely to some Christian organisation, which should care for him. This method of care should be better adapted to its purpose. We need boys' clubs attached to every church, into which boys leaving school and going to work should be naturally drafted. These clubs ought to be organised with a view to the actual facts of a boy's life : and ought not to make at first too great demands on their spiritual powers, which require special training during the period of transition from the discipline of school to almost complete freedom. We have not yet thought this out sufficiently with reference to human nature. Dr. Paton of Nottingham is working at this subject with much success ; I would advise you to refer to him.'

On October 9 the Bishop unveiled a window erected in Gray's Inn Chapel in memory of Archbishop Laud. He said of him :

'Laud was a man of great ideas, and a man who was unflinching and unwavering in his pursuit of truth . . . his ideal of the Church of England was probably higher and

truer than that of any other man, certainly of his time. . . . Personally, he was large-minded and tolerant, but he was prepared to use intolerance as a means of establishing a system of tolerance. . . . He upheld great principles of spiritual freedom, which were as yet imperfectly understood ; but he upheld them by methods which threatened the very foundations of English liberty. . . . Spiritual truth must make its way by conviction.’¹

On October 19 he preached at the service held in St. Paul’s Cathedral by the medical guild of St. Luke, and dined two days afterwards at the festival dinner of the guild. In response to Sir Dyce Duckworth’s remark that such a magnificent service as that in St. Paul’s could not have been held in any other country, he said :

‘ It is indeed characteristic of England that people of all sorts can combine round the Church of England without any feeling of hostility. When I have talked with men of science in other countries, I have found that they considered it impossible for a man who is a thinker to be in any sense whatever in friendship with the Church ; that this is not the case in this country makes me most hopeful for England and for the mission which she has in the world.’

He had not been one of those who received with a sneer the proposal made by the Emperor of Russia in the course of this year, that the great powers of Europe should consider the possibility of a gradual disarmament ; and on October 26, he took the chair at a peace meeting in Exeter Hall. He said that we ought to be proud of the growth of beneficent ideas, and that, though there must be many discouragements in the effort to bridge over the gulf between the ideal and the real, yet an enormous stride is taken when this process is begun.

‘ Such a stride has been taken in the great question of promoting peace, by the proposals of the Russian Emperor. . . . Let me ask you for a moment to consider what the proposal for disarmament implies. Put shortly it is this :—The existence of huge military establishments, and the prominence naturally given to them in the ordinary life of a country create in the popular mind a conception that the world is regulated by force only. Now in our internal affairs we in England have been foremost in striving to assert that the world ought to be regulated by justice. The Russian

¹ The sermon is published in *The Mind of St. Peter and other Sermons*.

Emperor pleads that a better chance should be given for applying this principle to international affairs also.'

He left the Emperor's proposals to be treated of by other speakers, and concluded :

' I will say no more on the subject of our meeting. But I must confess to you a peculiarity of my own. . . . I never like to tender advice about large subjects without carefully considering what I am doing in my own sphere to carry out the principles which I recommend. If we labour for peace, we must remember that like other good things it cannot be given us from the top, but requires our own efforts at the bottom. The first step towards peace is that we should each of us try to acquire a pacific temper. I sometimes wonder if the English people are quite successful in impressing other countries with the pacific disposition which we know they possess. There is a certain danger in thinking that our character as good-hearted, well-meaning fellows is so generally obvious that we need not pay much attention to the way we express it. News travels fast nowadays. It is not always quite accurate. Opinions are immediately formed, and next day are spread throughout the civilised world. . . . I should like to plead that true wisdom lies in stating opinions moderately, with due reserve and strict attention to courtesy. Let other and less powerful nations bluster. We are great enough and strong enough to show them a more excellent way. We are too established a firm to be perpetually greedy of small gains. We need not be anxious to carry fresh acquisitions to our imperial account. We can afford to trust to the capacity of the British race to hold a foremost place in the business of the world. I think we might cultivate a little more sympathy with other people, and show a little more generosity in our criticism of them.'

On November 2, he spoke at Peterborough in aid of the Cathedral Restoration Fund, and dwelt on the immense influence the Cathedral had exercised upon his mind. ' Never did I go into the Cathedral and look about, but that I learnt something new, received some new idea, discovered some new act of deftness, some application of means to ends which tells the story so ennobling to us of the perpetual, the continuous activity of mankind.' To him it had indeed been a living building.

‘The more I meditated about it,’ he said, ‘the more I used to see in it not only of the better but also of the more common and ordinary motives which combine to make up the English character, and the building itself constantly grew before my mind in its significance as being an epitome of all that England was in the past, and all that England was aspiring to be in the present.’

On November 4, he lectured on Heroes¹ at the request of the Social and Political Education League, and pointed out the dangers and the limitations of hero worship. This lecture was largely the result of his reflections on Lord Acton’s view that great men are almost always bad men.² Some of the things he said sound like the result of his own experience: ‘The life of a ruler or a statesman is always complicated, and he cannot simplify problems at his pleasure.’ ‘It is seldom in the conduct of affairs that a man can do his best; he is generally driven to pursue the second best as being the only practicable course.’ ‘There are great dangers attaching to the possession of power. Those who are entrusted with it soon discover how far-reaching those dangers are. It is a real support to them to feel that they will be judged by a higher standard than that of their immediate success.’

On November 21, he presided at a conference on economic training; on December 5, he was at the opening of the new buildings of the London Library, and on the 19th he went up to Liverpool to give an address at the centenary celebration of the Liverpool Athenæum.³ He had been persuaded to do this because Mr. Alfred Booth, instead of trusting to a letter, had travelled all the way from Liverpool to ask him to come, and he felt that such zeal deserved to succeed.

These are examples of the things he did outside the regular course of his episcopal work. During these three months before Christmas he was also giving his addresses on ‘the Position of the Church of England’ to the rural-decanal conferences. He was present at many public dinners, amongst others the Guildhall and the Royal Society dinners, and was entertained by the Vagabonds’ Club. He

¹ Published in *Lectures and Addresses*.

² See vol. i. p. 372.

³ This address is published in *Thoughts on Education*.

spoke at meetings of the Church Historical Society, of the Police Court Mission, and of many other organisations.

The 'Westminster Gazette' said of him, 'though in one way or another he speaks about six times a day, he is never at a loss, not only for words, but for interesting words, and he always speaks as if the subject of the hour was the only one he had on his mind. But, can his heart beat with his tongue on all these varied occasions?' The secret of his power was probably not only his genuine interest in the subject which claimed him for the moment, but even more his strong sympathy with those to whom he was speaking, which made him able to bring up out of the store of his knowledge and thought something that fitted each occasion.

This autumn had brought a new task, for he had been appointed a member of the London University Commission.

Lord Davey, chairman of the commission, says of his work there :

'On the rare occasions on which I differed from him, I did so with great misgiving and in one case at least was convinced that his view was the right one to take. His suggestions were most valuable in solving a difficulty or subject of difference amongst our colleagues by some middle course. Even in the matter of draftsmanship, he was ready with an apt phrase to express our meaning. What I was most struck with was his intimate acquaintance with the various centres of London teaching and the large way in which he looked at things. In settling the list of recognised schools and teachers in the new faculty of theology, I was very much impressed by his attitude towards the Jewish and nonconformist theology. He was as anxious as any of us that the new faculty should be comprehensive and tend to the promotion of learning and research and not merely orthodoxy. He was always on the side of comprehensiveness, of making the reorganised university as wide and modern as possible, and fitting it to meet the demands both of practical needs and business.'

Mr. Bailey Saunders, the secretary of the commission, says :

'Of the practical qualities he displayed, none seemed to me more remarkable or more conducive to the dispatch of business than his talent for furthering the progress of debate. This was most conspicuous when, in the chairman's absence,

he was called to preside. He possessed a singular capacity for giving the discussion a fresh and invigorating turn ; he had many a shrewd and humourous comment to make as arguments were raised, and he could listen with patience ; but he knew when a point had been sufficiently laboured, and more especially where rival interests were strongly or persistently asserted, his was often the suggestion that most rapidly cleared the way. If by common consent he was adroit in overcoming difficulties, I should say that his success sprang not so much from any affection for weak or hasty compromises, still less from a cynical indifference to the issue, as from a real desire to be comprehensive and tolerant. In this respect neither his connexion with the older universities nor his ecclesiastical position inspired him with any prejudice against certain tendencies in the University of London. On the contrary, they made him more eager to consider and satisfy its special needs. In the settlement of all the important questions, in the drafting of the new constitution, in the admission of the first schools, and in the recognition of the first teachers of the university he took an important part. . . . Where theology was concerned, he frankly recognised the principle that the university was to be free from any dogmatic or sectarian restrictions. With one exception the schools admitted for theology alone were nonconformist, and took their place in accordance with the recommendations of a previous commission. Both in the recognition of the teachers, however, and in the formation of a faculty the Bishop showed every desire to keep to the spirit of those recommendations, and I shall not easily forget a pleasant hour which I spent with him at Fulham settling the list of names, and how readily he sanctioned any suggestion that tended to make them broadly representative of every denomination, every college, and every subject of study. Whether the teachers were churchmen, dissenters or Jews did not matter, if only their position or the instruction which they gave was of a kind to be recognised. A remark which he made to me was, I felt, in his opinion particularly applicable to the study of theology—namely that there was a great difference between theology and religion.’

The Bishop describes how another unexpected labour came upon him this year :

‘Just as I had returned from a holiday, and my mind was in that generally amiable and confiding condition which a holiday is intended to create, I received a telegram, de-

manding an immediate answer, which asked if I would welcome the Church Congress in London. I had no time to consult any of my advisers, whose duty, as you know, is to curb my excessive benevolence, and I felt that I might be causing inconvenience if I sent a selfish refusal. So I left myself in the hands of the committee, though I reflected with a sigh that I was weakly parting with one of the traditional immunities of the see of London. Indeed when I was appointed to that office, and was searching for some compensations, one of the thoughts which crossed my mind was, "Well, at least, I am safe from the labours of a Church Congress."

He used to say that the Church Congress had been sprung upon him. From December onwards Church Congress committees were added to his other engagements.

During all this time he was constantly struggling with the ritual difficulties, and was being abused and attacked in public and in private. Once he was even mobbed on coming out of a church in Bethnal Green by a body of roughs, who raised the 'no popery' cry. He wrote to his niece, 'I have to go my way and be abused by people who want to stamp on someone else, or rather want me to stamp for them.'

Two Sundays with friends in the country, where he enjoyed long walks in the glowing autumn woods, were his sole relaxation during these anxious months.

LETTERS 1898

To Professor Collins (now Bishop of Gibraltar)

'Fulham: January 15, 1898.

'Dear Collins,—I have not yet seen Vaughan's document.¹ I do not know if that controversy is worth carrying on. I certainly think, if it is, that the whole theological position must be faced. Of course the Archbishops answered the Pope because we were attacked. But the English episcopate will not begin a controversy with Vaughan. It must come from some other source, if at all.

'Fulham Palace: February 9, 1898.

'My dear Collins,—Your paper seems admirable. Vaughan has written for the Roman-minded Anglicans, who hanker after a logical system founded on authority. His

¹ A Vindication of the Bull 'Apostolicæ Curæ.'

arguments, as you show, begin and end with the assumption of the existence of such authority as necessary to produce a desired result. He amends the Pope by dragging in everything which is irrelevant to the exact issue, and trying to assume the correctness of the whole body of Roman theology as it now exists, as though it had existed always. I wonder if Romans really believe that, or if it is only a convenient assumption. While they posit development as necessary to produce what is, they never admit the operation of the process. The *Marian* bishops must have taken the same view that they do: and so on universally. This makes their history impossible.

To Lady Grey

Fulham Palace: January 20, 1898.

‘Your letter gave me great delight. I rejoice to think of you as restored to a great degree. But I think there is only one stage between youth and age—it is when one feels if the grass is wet before sitting down upon it. The bore is having to think about one’s physical and material self at all. The question of degree does not matter much.

‘I am not going to be busy; it is a bad habit, and must be suppressed. I purpose to find time to come and drop in upon you when you don’t want me. I can utter no more ferocious threat. It is awful to think of the number of persons who come to see me whom I don’t want to see. I have contracted a rapid way of getting rid of them by bringing them to the point, and giving an answer at once. Of course this is not what people wish: their desire is to use you as an anvil on which they beat out themselves. But then, as a rule, there is wonderfully little to beat out, and it is so thin that it hurts the anvil. . . .

‘Edward must take in hand the reorganisation of the Liberal party. Really things can never go on unless the game is properly played. The whole of our system of politics is founded on the supposition that alternative policies are before the public, and that it can choose. But you can’t make a policy out of other people’s mistakes. It must be a policy of your own, and must have contents.

‘There is a question which occupies my mind, so far as I have a mind left. It is, what do we mean by liberty? We shall only make a new start in politics when we decide that question. The political history of England during this century is briefly this: Englishmen have carried out their conception of liberty into all their institutions without deciding what that conception was. Now we are all free, and

we don't know where we are. We won't find out till we have decided what liberty is. There is no idea on which to construct an ideal. Think for a moment. Socialism can only rest on a vigorous system of discipline, which can only be tyranny, if it is not accepted on moral grounds from within. Yet the socialists dare not say so ; they dare not even hint at the necessity of discipline. Everything is pursued and recommended on the grounds that liberty means doing what one likes. We are living on political habits formed in the past. They are fast passing away because they rest on little in the present. How are we to get something ? That is my present problem.

To Dr. Garnett

‘ Fulham Palace : March 7, 1898.

‘ Thank you very much for your book.¹ It is not a “compendium” such as I was contemplating, but a collection of criticism. Literary history stands on a basis of its own. It has to supply enough information to bridge over the gulf between the point of view of the past and that of the present. It is curious how little that process is needed in English literature. Chaucer, Shakespeare, Milton, need no explanation of that kind. It is only when you reach Dryden and Pope that cause has to be shown why they should be read.

‘ I was interested in talking this over in reference to Italian literature with an Italian friend. He said that instruction in the history of Italian literature was the most important part of an Italian's education. Their literature at every point was connected with mental and social life which were different from those of the present. It had not struck me so forcibly before, but it is true that Italian history and literature are more intelligible to an Englishman than to an Italian of to-day.

To C. D.

‘ London House : March 24, 1898.

‘ You have raised a question about the religion of the Mahommedans which always interests me. My own experience of them has been disappointing. I did not see much religion in Algeria. It seems to me that they get credit for two things : Oriental fatalism and disregard of life (in themselves signs of low civilisation), which are counted to them as faith : and strong race hatred (again a sign of low civilisation), which is counted to them as religious zeal. I mean the question is : How far are religions clothing of natural qualities ? How far are they motives and powers

¹ *A History of Italian Literature.*

which transform these natural qualities? I think Mahomedanism is a mere clothing; it is an expression of the best that can be made of Orientals, leaving their life as it is. Now Christianity has no reference to special modes of thought or life: and moreover puts a most tremendous strain on human nature, presenting no definite end of worship or of life.

To G. H.

‘ Fulham Palace : June 17, 1898.

‘ . . . It seems to me that your health is like mine: we have too much to think about. Only I never worry. When a thing is done I have done with it. It is useless to take more responsibility than human shoulders can bear. We can only do our best as occasion offers. We are never entirely wise or entirely right. The only thing to do is to try and be wiser. People like to avoid that by disclaiming their own responsibility, and voting themselves exceptional persons. We all have different natural gifts, different temperaments, and different temptations. But our business is to make the most of ourself: and to take care of our weak points. A man with a weak chest would be foolish if he did not wrap up properly. So we have to do with our character. It may be a nuisance: but it is not such a nuisance as catching a fearful cold and being ill for a month. But people’s characters have more severe illnesses than their bodies, only they do not feel it in the same way. Take care of yourself and —, and cheer up. Remember that cheerfulness is a virtue.

‘ Fulham Palace : October 13, 1898.

‘ . . . You must always expect to be misunderstood in life. One has to make up one’s mind on one’s own responsibility, and trust to time to show that one was right. I dare say one will find out that one was not so right as one thought, but one can only do one’s best, and be ready to do better if one sees how. So cheer yourself up with that reflection. There is nothing but “patient perseverance” in well-doing” to put the foolishness of others to rebuke.

To Mrs. T. H. Ward

‘ Bettws-y-Coed : August 5, 1898.

‘ My dear Mary,—The month of August enables one to discharge duties long neglected because impossible. I have just had time to read through “ Helbeck ” with the attention which it deserved. Everybody else has done so ages ago, and my remarks will be flat and stale. The book interested me greatly. I think you have got hold of a very real tragedy, and have worked it out with admirable precision. The war

of the intellect and the feelings is perhaps the deepest form which the tragic motive takes in our time. You have displayed the conflict in itself—Romanism and indifference are not to you things in themselves, but are merely two modes of looking at life, each to some degree accidental, but embodying positions from which it is hard to move merely on receiving notice from the feelings. Moreover you have raised another question, the need of discipline for character, and the source whence such discipline is to be obtained. It is not so much that Helbeck is a Roman, and Laura is indifferent: but Helbeck is a character formed by a system which especially aims at forming character. Laura has never been formed at all. The excellent impulses of the free spirit dash and are broken against the power of character even when formed upon an exaggerated and unintelligent basis. Of course if Laura had possessed any system of her own, she could have dealt with another system: she could have measured distances and determined points of agreement. But no system will not do.

‘I think this is a great truth for our generation to learn. There must be some system for everybody. The attitude of superior critical capacity for valuing the defects of all systems will not do. Every life has to be built upon something. If not, the clash against a life that has a foundation is fatal.

‘But I am wandering into a sermon of my own à propos of your book, which is not fair. . . . It is a wet day: there is a row on every side of me. I am beginning to be a new creature. I think it is worth while to live in London for the joy of going out into the country. Things are only understood by being felt, and are felt in the way of comparison. We are all engaged in that process.’

‘Bettws-y-Coed: August 10, 1898.

‘Dear Mary,—It is a rainy day; one enjoys a rainy day, because it curbs one’s external energies and gives space for letters. I said nothing about the love story in “Helbeck,” which I thought was admirably done, and with very delicate touches. But then its beauty and grace were overshadowed by the main situation—I see no way out of that difficulty. One feels that they *had* to fall in love, and this interferes with the sense of inevitableness which is necessary for the full enjoyment of a love story. I know you will say that it need not: but every branch of art rests on preconceptions, and the perception of an end takes off from the spontaneity of the process. But all the same the development of the love-story was excellent, and you had obviously gone with it. . . .

'I am interested in your question. You know that I have almost a craze for liberty. But liberty must be claimed and used by the individual amid the systems by which he is surrounded. His claim is that the systems of the majority should be also adapted to the small minority. But that minority rests upon culture and intelligence. These are not the possessions of the multitude. It always seems to me that the intelligent person must frame his own life, and use what he finds outside for his own purposes. He listens unmoved to all sorts of opinions because he has his own. He cannot be more than an influence, a spirit which rises above the inevitable differences of one-sided expressions of opinions. But he transgresses his *rôle* if he wishes to make everything new to fit himself. Knowledge silently transforms systems. I do not know that it can wisely create its own. If it does so, it only creates an ideal for which it is useless to strive by actual conflict. It is powerful within, as expanding and deepening, comprehending. Its own creations are unsatisfying, for it neglects the broad foundations to emphasise points of detail.

'The tendency in England has been for all systems to grow more definite lately. This is due to the greater interest in the lower classes. All elementary teaching has to be definite. Simple minds do not appreciate fine shades. Systems are useful in proportion to their strength.

'Religious bodies are now striving to hold the working classes. The consequence is a general recrudescence of unintelligence, an interest in externals. Intelligence will revive doubtless; it always does. But it must make its own way and bring its influence to bear by using what it can and teaching external systems to recognise their inward meaning.'

To Professor H. Sidgwick

' Bettwys-y-Coed : August 13, 1898.

'Dear Sidgwick,—Holiday has given me time to read the "Essays,"¹ which you were good enough to send me. They have interested me very much. Your analysis of "Public Morality" clears up several matters. I think that Acton does not face the difference you have pointed out between the principles on which a statesman may act and those on which a historian ought to judge him. But this raises the further question of the relation between these standards. It seems to me that the critic should first do his best to enter into the position of his subject and see things as he saw them. But he has the advantage of seeing how these things turned

¹ *Practical Ethics*, a collection of essays and addresses by H. Sidgwick.

out, and what was the result of the action taken. Here, however, he must be rather careful and not introduce his own pre-suppositions. But there is a point which you have not touched on—the moral influence on his generation of a public man. Take Bismarck for instance : he lowered the tone of European diplomacy. How is this to be set against his positive achievements ? The sort of moral judgment I am frequently led to is of this sort : “ His aims were for the good of his country as it was then understood, its territorial extension &c. &c., but in pursuing these aims he told so many lies, and did so many brutal actions, and showed such an example of personal selfishness, that I do not know whether he did more good to the material interests of his country or harm to its spiritual growth.”

‘ The educational effect of the doings of a prominent man is enormous : how are we to appraise it with other qualities and achievements ?

‘ I quite agree with you about clerical veracity. It is curious how the moral sense of the community has practically ruled out Rashdall’s view.

‘ I am enjoying this place very much, and feel a different person. It is worth while being in London, from an epicurean point of view, to enjoy a holiday.’

To the Hon. and Rev. A. T. Lyttelton (on his appointment as Bishop of Southampton)

‘ Rheims : September 23, 1898.

‘ Dear Lyttelton,—I am glad of your news, though not so glad as I would like to be—because it is rather a disappointment to myself personally. I sorely wanted you to help me in West London, where the Bishop of Marlborough must soon cease his labours, and where you would have been ideal—but that must pass with other things. So I will congratulate you heartily, and can only say I think it much nicer to be a suffragan bishop than a diocesan bishop. You have all the sweets and escape the bitters of the episcopal office. . . . Therefore make the best of it while you may. Of course you will cease to be my examining chaplain—I can only express my deep gratitude for what you have done for me in that capacity.

‘ We are just returning from a lovely holiday. We have not had a drop of rain since we left England ; and we have been in places where there were no English. If ever you want information about holidays south of the Alps, please apply to me. I am gathering a large amount of knowledge on that subject. I hope to return home vigorous, but before Christ-

mas I shall be sorely reduced again. Let me recommend you to take holidays of a week from time to time : change is absolutely necessary. Also once a week have a good long sleep. These are practical suggestions which experience has taught me.'

To his niece Winifred

'October 14, 1898.

'Somebody sent me a book from which I copy a sentence which has much truth : "What a man is constantly imagining to himself, *that* he becomes. The prevalent habit of his will is the distinctive character of every man."

'Does not that explain what I try to say about your dreaming vaguely? Nothing is really vague : or rather vague dreaming tends to produce vague action. Character is expressed in *will* : and will is the thing to be aimed at.'

(Written at a meeting of the British Museum Trustees)

'October 22.

'You speak of the difficulty of developing one's will. It is hard, and I always think that the Epistle of to-morrow is so stirring on that point : "See that ye walk circumspectly (i.e. carefully, accurately), not as fools, but as wise." It is this *accuracy* which is so difficult : to do the thing one wants to do and not something else. For this purpose one must know what one wants and make up one's mind. Of course you by nature belong to the class of those who wait for an impulse from without ; this is useful if it stirs one up to do what one has determined from within. But an impulse, a pleasure, an enjoyment, must have a direction beforehand along which they can carry us. Otherwise we merely stagger a little, and then stand where we were before. The object of life is to get on, not to stand.

'The Prince is talking loud about Bismarck, which is not part of the meeting, and I dare not listen, as it is not addressed to me.'

'November 11, 1898.

'Ruskin's main idea is that beauty is goodness, and that art is morality ; and that you will make men good through teaching them to admire beauty. I am afraid that this is not entirely true. There is even a moral danger in the love of beauty for itself alone. The feeling may uplift or it may debase, according to previous habit of mind.'

To his nephew Basil

'British Museum : December 10, 1898.

'I have been very busy for a long time, and am looking forward to a holiday at Christmas time. . . . I do not know that anything of great interest has been happening to me

lately, except that I sat next to the Sirdar (Lord Kitchener) one night at dinner, and found him very nice. He is a very straightforward soldier, very much bored at having to endure so many dinners, and very glad that he was going back to Egypt. He said that he would rather fight many battles than make speeches. I quite sympathised with him.'

To Mr. H. S. Harrison

' Fulham Palace : December 10, 1898.

' Dear Sir,—The English people generally are given to speak out their opinions wise and foolish alike. The most foolish are the loudest. We have also a habit of regarding our differences as of vital importance when they really are not. The points in dispute are the best way of teaching the one faith to the English people. Rites and ceremonies are merely the means of teaching the truth : they are not the truth itself.

' The English people are committed to the care of the English Church. From time to time they express their opinion about the mode of teaching which is applied to them. The Church of Rome is a small body in England, which stands in no relation to the religious life of the nation. It is quite impossible that any considerable number of Englishmen should be Roman Catholics. To join yourself to that Church is simply to stand on one side and cut yourself off from your part in striving to do your duty for the religious future of your country. That duty may be at times difficult and unpleasant. Duty generally is so. But we must not shirk it on that account, or try to find peace for ourselves by standing on one side.'

To Mr. F. Statham

' Fulham Palace : December 14, 1898.

' My dear Sir,—You are right in thinking that pressure on my time has prevented me from reading your book¹ before now. I can thank you very sincerely for sending it to me. It is the result of much experience, personal experience, of the difficulties of thinking straight on religious matters. It is an impossible claim to take up a detached, impartial outside attitude to any subject which is intimately connected with individual life. But you insist on the obligation to think as fairly and impartially about religion as one can. It has always seemed to me that the preconceptions of the critical mind need examination just as much as the preconceptions of the credulous mind—Human morality would disappear before the treatment which is sometimes dealt to revealed religion.

¹ *Free Thought and True Thought.*

‘Your final conclusion is that that reflection, fairly carried out, produces an attitude towards life on the part of the earnest inquirer which he can recognise as similar to that which Christianity aims at producing. After all the important thing is a man’s attitude towards life. Some may attain it after severe struggles ; others by a gradual development on a system. It always seemed to me that Robert Elsmere supposed that he had gained a new point of view ; but as a matter of fact he only set to work to do what he did before, single-handed, bereft of his former helps, and a weaker man.

‘I draw no moral from this : Every man must be the guardian of his own sincerity. But a process of thinking, steadily pursued, often brings a man to his starting point, though he may not recognise the fact.’

CHAPTER XI

THE LAMBETH HEARING

ON August 23, 1898, Dr. Creighton had written to the Bishop of Rochester :

‘I see little prospect of peace in our work after the holidays. Our lot has fallen in evil times ; but we must hope to get some good out of it. The process, however, is painful, and our temper and attitude matter much. May God give us wisdom and patience.’

His attempts to regulate occasional services had met with encouraging results ; still the new year began with a general sense of unrest. The ordinary man could not know what the bishops had been doing to enforce discipline ; and there was a good deal of soreness on the part of those who had been obliged to give up cherished customs.

The Bishop’s views are shown in the following letters :

To the Rev. E. H. Hall

‘Fulham Palace : January 11, 1899.

‘The position is :—there has been a period of rather arbitrary experiments. These are now challenged : it is no good considering why or how : a system must always have an answer to give. These experiments rest upon a basis which is outside the limits of the Anglican system.

‘This cannot stand investigation. We may have a Catholic *spirit*, but we cannot use the spirit to over-ride the system.

‘The English people are very conservative : they cannot understand ingenious experiments to explain things away.

‘The Anglican system rests upon a logical basis. Upset its principles, and you are in a sphere of arbitrary private judgment.

‘It is this assertion of arbitrary private judgment on the part of clergy or congregation which causes disquiet.

‘We must fall into line on a liberal interpretation of the

Anglican system ; this must be by reference to its *principles*, not its *letter*.

‘ This is the object which I am steadily pursuing, without, I trust, undue haste, or pedantry, or pressure.

‘ Apply this to the particular question you raised.

‘ *Reservation* must obviously cease.

‘ It is unwise under this head to raise the question of communicating sick persons from the open Communion in Church.

‘ It is unwise to raise that question at all now : because

‘ (1) It is regarded with suspicion from its undue extension.

‘ (2) If raised now, it would receive a general answer, which would be of great weight in the future.

‘ (3) It is inevitable that at present rigorist views of interpretation might prevail.

‘ (4) It is undesirable that a crisis like this should lead to any combined expression on the part of the episcopate.

‘ (5) It is unwise to strengthen the hands of those who demand new legislation.’

To the Rev. N. Loraine ‘ Fulham Palace, S.W. : January 13, 1899.

‘ It is an age of great unrest. . . . We must remember that we are not dealing only with outward manifestations, but with tendencies of thought. We must try and discover on what these tendencies rest—and must make room for all that is admissible in them. This is a difficult process and requires a gradual education of the public mind. I think that the first danger of a considerable schism has been averted. The extremists have abandoned some of their extreme principles.

‘ My address to the Ruridecanal conferences will appear in a day or two, with an appendix which carries further the principles there laid down. It is only by a general acceptance of such principles that we can be drawn into line. If the Church of England does not know what it means, or how to express its meaning, it is in a sorry plight. We must discover its real strength and patiently make it manifest.’

Four days after writing this he received a letter containing some resolutions passed at a private meeting of 220 incumbents of the ritualist party held in the Holborn Town Hall. The original intention had been that these resolutions should not be published, but should be sent to the bishops with a covering letter. However, somehow the

'Daily News' got hold of them, and they became public property. They stated

'(1) That by canonical obedience is meant obedience to the Canons, and to the bishop of the diocese calling on any individual to conform to the law, usages, customs and rites of the Church which have canonical authority.

'(2) That the clergy owe it to the whole Catholic Church to refuse to obey any demands which conflict with the law, usages, &c., of the Church, whether œcumenical or provincial, which have canonical authority.

'(3) That the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament in parish churches and for the *bona-fide* purpose of communicating the sick and dying, and the ceremonial use of incense being "laudable practices of the whole Catholic Church," and both being included in the directions contained in the Ornaments Rubric, the right to such reservation and ceremonial use of incense cannot and must not be abandoned.'

The Bishop saw at once that these resolutions would raise a new storm. He wrote to Prebendary Villiers, who had signed the covering letter :

Private

'London House : January 17, 1899.

'Dear Prebendary Villiers,—I was surprised to see your name on a circular which I have received enclosing resolutions which I find it hard to interpret. I wish I knew what people meant by "canonical" as applied to the law, usages, &c. of the Church.

'Of course the only meaning which the outside public can put upon it is that there are clergy who are going to defy the bishops. I need not say that the bishops can do no more than declare the law of the Church of England. They have no power to make it or to explain it away. They can only *declare* it. When they are called upon, as at present, they must declare it.

'If you say that you are going to pay no heed to that declaration, where are you? There is a clamour for new legislation to make the law of the Church more clear and to enforce it. I do not see how this can be prevented if notice is given that a large body of the clergy rest upon some principles of "the doctrine and discipline of Christ" which pays no heed to the definition "as this Church and realm have received the same."

'What do you expect the bishops to do? That is the practical question, and you do not supply an answer.'

‘ Fulham Palace : January 20, 1899.

‘ My dear Prebendary Villiers,—My letter to you was, as you say, private: I wanted to understand what was in the mind of those present at the meeting.

‘ Let me put before you the position as it appears to me. There have been a number of experiments made in the Church: many of them have outstripped the limits which the English people are prepared to accept.

‘ You must admit that any method of teaching must have reference to those who are taught. The faith can be taught in many ways; none is absolutely essential. Former usages were framed with reference to their utility, which depended on their acceptability. The resolutions passed at the meeting seemed to ignore this primary truth. Ceremonies are made for man, not man for ceremonies. It is just this point which the bishop has to decide. Individual priests may say, “I think this or that is good for my people.” A bishop represents the unity of the Church as a whole. This was the original function of his office.

‘ The resolutions practically assume that out of the vast museum of ecclesiastical antiquities of the past, every priest has a right to choose what he likes, and to carry it into practice provided he can find an adequate body of people who agree with him. This is subversive of all principles of unity and of government.

‘ We all must recognise the true nature of our task, which is to teach the Gospel to the English people in a way which that people understands. It is worth while to take a great deal of trouble to find out what this is.

‘ I agree with you that this ought to be done deliberately after full discussion. I am quite ready, nay, I am anxious to have certain points argued in full before the Archbishop. I hope that this may be done.’

To the Rev. W. B. Trevelyan, who wrote that, as one of the conveners of the Holborn meeting he did not wish to appear rebellious, the Bishop answered:

‘ Fulham Palace : January 24, 1899.

‘ My dear Mr. Trevelyan,—Thank you for your letter. I very much wish that it were possible to get things straight in any way. In a fortnight Parliament meets, and the House of Commons will ring with denunciations of lawless clergymen and cowardly bishops. What answer is to be made? I have been asked by many M.P.’s, but what can I say?

‘ If I give commands they will be disobeyed, or rather,

not obeyed. And no intelligible statement is made of the nature of [the] authority which commands obedience.

‘The Holborn resolutions were most disastrous. I dare say they had a meaning, but it was not obvious. They only stated what you would not do ; they were silent about what you were willing to do.

‘This is really doing harm to the public conscience. Instead of being a pattern to the State, the Church is a shocking example of what to avoid. It ought to be possible to state a case which shall be intelligible to the people at large. The present excitement arises because they are in the presence of action which they do not understand, founded on principles which are not declared, and subversive of that good understanding and willingness to make the best of other people on which English life is based.

‘I think this issue ought to be faced in a clear manner.’

Mr. Trevelyan answered that the resolutions had not been intended to be as defiant as they were supposed to be, and that he thought the faithful laity had as much a right to be heard as the ‘man in the street.’

‘Fulham Palace : January 28, 1899.

‘My dear Mr. Trevelyan,—Of course you are quite right from your own point of view : but so is everybody else. The resolutions of the Holborn meeting were not understood by me in the sense you give them. In fact procedure by means of resolutions, published without any explanation, is a very dangerous method.

‘I quite admit the ground for your “rights,” but these rights are to particular modes of teaching. Now teaching must have reference to the persons to be taught, and to the institution which contains them.

‘I think you underestimate “the man in the street.” After all our duty is to make religion prevail in every sphere of life. It is rather a temptation to educate fully a select circle, and let go our general influence. Surely we should aim at combining the two. It seems to me that the present commotion raises the question “What is the best form in which the Christian faith can be put before the English people as a whole ?” You see that the necessity of a bishop’s position puts that question prominently before him. Indeed, that was the object of episcopacy, to secure the unity of the Church, to form a link between the several congregations. It is this large question which I should like to see faced.

‘Doubtless you will agree with me, as I do with you.

There is danger in doing anything; there is danger in doing nothing. But I think that it ought to be possible to devise something.'

To Mr. W. J. Birkbeck

Private

'Fulham Palace: January 19, 1899.

'My dear Birkbeck,—The position at present is this: For some time a series of experiments have been made; they are now challenged, and appeal is made to the bishops to declare and enforce the existing condition of the usages and customs of the Church of England. They cannot suggest a compromise. Things have passed beyond that, owing to the foolishness of a few who have flaunted red rags.

'The question is by what authority they do these things. They do not give any intelligible answer.

'Now the question of incense, applied ceremonially to persons and things, has been decided, not on the unhistorical view of the Ornaments Rubric, but with reference to principles. The question of interpretation is, does the O.R. mean: Ornaments shall be used for the services contained in this book, taken in their relation to the nature of those services—or: Ornaments shall be used as they were in the old services, according to the intention of those services?

'This is a question of interpretation, on which the bishops cannot now claim to make an advance on previous decisions. The use of incense as an accompaniment to the Prayer Book services is one thing: its use as carrying a number of ceremonies, not otherwise alluded to, is another thing.

'The case must be stated and argued on its merits. But meanwhile the bishops cannot do anything but stand on the view that has been recognised. I think you must admit the inevitableness of their position.'

To Mr. T. Cheney Garfit

'Fulham Palace: January 20, 1899.

'My dear Sir,—Every Englishman wants to get his own way, and thinks that it is obviously right and quite easy to get. But he often forgets that every other Englishman thinks the same. However, when he feels that he is in a strong majority, he considers it very easy to wipe out the minority.

'Unfortunately an administrator feels that this is not the case. Minorities are very troublesome, especially when they are driven into a corner.

'May I ask you to consider a few general truths of history?

‘(1) The suppression of opinions has never succeeded in England.

‘(2) The history of the English Church is a history of vain attempts to obtain peace by exclusion.

‘(3) When we look back upon the past we sympathise with those who were excluded, forgetting the points at issue, and remembering only the value of liberty as a principle of our national life.

‘(4) There is no real force in England except the force of public opinion. This operates on the minds of those against whom it is directed by argument and not by coercion.

‘(5) The bishops can do something if they are supported by public opinion. But that opinion does not strengthen their hands by abusing them for not acting when they had no opinion behind them.’

For some time it had been said, that what the extreme party desired was an opportunity for stating their case to the bishops in such a way that full consideration might be given to all the points involved in their contention. In the Preface to the Prayer Book it is stated that ‘for the resolution of all doubts, concerning the manner how to understand, do, and execute, the things contained in this Book; the parties that so doubt . . . shall always resort to the Bishop of the diocese who by his discretion shall take order for the quieting and appeasing of the same,’ but that if he ‘be in doubt, then may he send for the resolution thereof unto the archbishop.’ It seemed to Archbishop Temple that these words suggested a means of giving the opportunity desired for discussing the legality of the disputed practices. After consulting with the Archbishop of York and the Bishops of London and Winchester in December about the desirability of this course, he proposed in January that he should announce that he would be ready to hear the defence of those who might be brought before him by their bishop for ritual practices of doubtful legality. The other bishops approved, the Bishop of London considered it was desirable that men should be obliged to show what grounds they had for the esoteric practices which they claimed to be rightful within the Church of England.

On January 21 the following statement appeared in the newspapers. ‘The Archbishops have agreed that, in order

to give more confidence to the clergy and laity that their views and opinions shall be fully considered before any decision is given by either Archbishop on any question submitted to him in accordance with the directions of the Prayer Book, he will allow those who are concerned in the case to argue the matter openly before him, either personally or by counsel. And to guard against contradictory decisions in the two provinces, neither Archbishop will pronounce his decision without first consulting the other Archbishop.' It was decided that the points to be first submitted to the Archbishops should be the use of portable lights and the ceremonial use of incense, and that reservation should be discussed at a further hearing. After some friendly consultation it was agreed, that the Bishop of London should present the case of the Rev. Henry Westall and the Bishop of Norwich that of the Rev. Henry Ram before the Archbishops. The hearing was fixed to take place early in May. The Bishop of London engaged Mr. (now Sir Lewis) Dibdin and Mr. Errington as counsel. He also wrote to Professor Collins as follows :

' London House : March 22, 1899.

' My dear Collins,—I want your help in an important matter. The Archbishop is, as you know, to hold a Court for the decision of some points which practically involve the interpretation of the Ornaments Rubric, and the relation between Ornaments and Ceremonies. There has been some delay in settling the exact procedure. But I have at last instructed Dibdin to represent me in the pleading. He would like to have some expert to whom he might turn for historical reference on points which may be raised by the other side. You know your way about the books and authorities, and I hope you will be good enough to look up questions if it should be necessary.'

In answer to a private inquiry the Bishop explained what he had so far been able to do to remedy the existing disorder.

' London House : February 4, 1899.

' The present crisis has led to a marshalling of forces each of which states their extreme demands. The Evangelical formula, that "The Holy Communion is turned into the Roman Mass" requires definition at every turn. All that the bishops can do is to see that the principles of the Church

of England are not contravened. In doubtful matters they must act according to the principles of English justice and give the accused the benefit of the doubt.

'This is not what Sir W. Harcourt and his friends want. They clamour that the clergy should be dragooned by the bishops to uniformity with the customs which prevailed fifty years ago.

'With this preamble I will tell you what I have succeeded in doing.

'(1) I have revised the occasional services in more than two hundred churches, a gigantic task, involving great labour. There has been practically no opposition. The St. Alban's case settled that. All services that went beyond the Prayer Book have practically ceased. This is, in my opinion, of supreme importance, and goes to the root of the matter. It was in these developments that "Romanising tendencies" really lay.

'(2) I have stopped the ceremony of "Asperges." I do not think that it is now practised in the diocese.

'(3) I have enforced that the Communion Service should be said without additions or omissions. It seems to me that if the Prayer Book service be used as appointed, no ceremonies can affect its meaning for the worshipper. It was addition or omission which altered its tenor.

'(4) I have induced several churches which were contemplating the introduction of incense to abstain. It is noticeable that I had to deal with churchwardens and church councils more than with clergy.

'(5) Several churches have abandoned perpetual reservation, while not pledging themselves to discontinue it for known cases of sickness. This of course abandons "reservation" properly so called, and means the carrying of the Communion from church after the service—a very different thing theologically speaking.

'(6) I have stopped the carrying of lighted candles in procession, and their introduction during the service, in several cases.

'(7) I have stopped the use of manuals of devotion which did not seem to me to be in accordance with Anglican teaching.

'Speaking generally, I have found a reasonable readiness to obey except on these points—(1) carrying the Communion to sick persons, (2) the ceremonial use of incense, (3) the introduction of lights at the Gospel. Of these I have remitted (2) and (3) to the Archbishop, who will soon hear the pleadings and pronounce decision

‘I may say further (1) that I have never had a case of erroneous teaching submitted to me save once, when it appeared that the sermon was preached three years ago by a curate who no longer holds my licence, (2) that I have never used my veto, and have never had a case presented to me.

‘All institutions in England undergo development. Part of it is necessary, part of it is foolish. Those whose duty it is to watch the process can have no standard but that of the utility of the process for the ends of society, civil and religious alike. In so watching they are guided by public opinion, which is often obscure. When it states itself clearly, they have to disentangle what is permanent from its temporary form of expression, and have to make good by such wisdom as they possess what they see to be just and right. This is what the bishops are trying to do. But the clergy are naturally wrapped up in their own schemes and their own congregations. The bishops can only put before them the good of the Church as a whole. It must take a little time before this can sink in. Good sense will ultimately teach that the general system of the Church must be maintained against individualism. This is what the bishops have to express, and they do not expect to be thanked by either side in the process.’

Again he wrote :

‘Some clergymen are pursuing an ideal of their own, which may be justified on various technical or archæological grounds : but meanwhile they are irritating the great mass of the English people whom they are commissioned to teach. This is exactly a matter on which the bishop ought to pronounce an opinion, as trusted by all. His decision need not settle abstract questions, or take a legal form. It is unwise to challenge such a solution.’

‘January 13, 1899.

‘It is absolutely necessary at present to fall in on Anglican lines, widely interpreted ; but the lines must be clear before the interpretation can be satisfactory. I do not like asking for confidence, but it is of vital importance to the Church at present that the clergy should trust my knowledge of what is necessary.’

If the clamour for new legislation were successful, he was convinced that such legislation ‘would follow much more drastic lines than the old and would be very dangerous.’ During the winter Sir William Harcourt had written to the

'Times' a series of letters denouncing the bishops for their negligence in regard to ritual irregularities, and especially for what he described as 'their indiscriminate and unscrupulous use' of their power of veto, 'to throttle the course of justice and to paralyse the law.' When Parliament met, the Bishop of Winchester (Dr. Randall Davidson) called attention to these allegations in the House of Lords, and showed that, with three exceptions, one of which had occurred twenty-three years ago, no living bishop had ever exercised the veto at all. He was answered by Lord Kinnaird, and then Dr. Creighton spoke, saying how gladly he would have remained silent; but, as he was the person who had been most attacked, his silence might have been misinterpreted. He thought the crisis serious because

'It is vital in English life that men of different opinions, however widely they may differ, should appreciate and habitually understand one another, and treat one another with respect. We have lately, I think, been perilously near forgetting that very primary principle on which our national life is founded. It is a serious matter for the public welfare when any body of the community can be accused of lawlessness, and it is a particularly serious matter when that body is the clergy . . . that they should even lend a shadow to the supposition that they are lacking in that obedience to the law which is the foundation of our social system. . . . My right Rev. Brother . . . referred to those exceedingly interesting letters wherewith a great statesman¹ has from time to time thought fit to enlighten us. Interesting they certainly were, but I think they were more amusing than instructive. The picture that he drew was that of a Church riddled by the insidious treachery of a traitorous crew under the mismanagement of a body of craven and feeble-minded bishops, and in the middle of this universal disaster there steps forth the colossal figure of a new Elijah denouncing judgment—the only wise and good man—but denouncing judgment and at the same time clamouring that somebody else (of course the bishops) should take off his hands the trouble of slaying prophets of Baal. It was a picture drawn with all the dexterity of a practised hand, but still the misfortune of it was, that it was impossible to identify it with the actual world in which we live. . . . The mantle of Elijah, if I may say so, does not seem to have fallen upon the shoulders of the

¹ Sir William Harcourt.

noble Lord who has just addressed us, but I presume that the prophet himself has carried it away with him across the seas, probably for use on a future occasion.'

Sir William Harcourt himself had found out in managing the affairs of the country that

'coercion was no remedy ;' but 'apparently what you learn in civil matters does not necessarily apply to matters ecclesiastical . . . if it is only a handful of clergy with whom you are dealing, then the more coercion you use the better. . . . That is not the conclusion to which you would expect the bishops to come. What really is the state of things to which Sir William Harcourt wishes us to go back ? . . . Is it the old days of Elizabeth and the old Tudor conception of what a bishop's function is, that he should be a prosecuting officer on the part of the police ? . . . The bishops if they have been to blame have been to blame for this : that they have acted as Englishmen, and not as ecclesiastics, and have trusted themselves to the common sense of the people. . . . Prosecution and persecution are very closely connected in the mind of the ordinary Englishman : and those who have to administer the affairs of the Church will always remember, that that public opinion which goads them to persecute their clergy would be the very first to desert them and hold them up to derision, when they had undertaken the task forced upon them. . . . Prosecutions were abandoned because they absolutely failed. It is a matter of fact that after each period in which prosecution for ecclesiastical offences has been inaugurated, instead of there being a going back of ritualism, there has been a distinct advance of it. . . . It is assumed that when prosecution ceased the bishops were doing nothing.'

He explained how in the country dioceses disputed questions had been settled by episcopal intervention and the good sense and good feeling of the parishioners ; but London presented peculiar conditions, owing to the want of strong parochial feeling, and to the fact that any stray visitor to a church felt that he had a right to complain to the Bishop of London if he saw something that he did not like. The good sense of the community had now declared strongly against certain extravagances, and 'it is that declaration which constitutes a crisis. . . . The bishops are very glad to have their hands strengthened by the declaration of the good sense

of the community. With that behind them they can do much. Unfortunately the popular mind is more interested in the regulation of small points of ceremonial than in the direction of tendencies which lie much deeper.' He told what he had been able to do with regard to the regulation of additional services. It was solely in the subsidiary question of the mode in which services should be conducted that his ruling had been disputed. These cases were now to be submitted to the Archbishop.

'In that way I believe that a great deal of obscurity may be cleared up. . . . It is always difficult to meddle with the tendencies of human thought. The whole history of the past is against the idea that tendencies of human thought can be regulated at our will by appeals to judicial tribunals. Nothing should be dealt with so tenderly as a man's conscientious convictions, misguided though they may be. There is no way of bringing back unity and good understanding except by setting forth great principles of truth, and setting them forth so clearly that they cannot be misunderstood, misapplied, or misconstrued.'

In the House of Commons the question was raised by Mr. Samuel Smith, in an amendment to the Address. The nature of the discussion and the comments in the Press showed how deeply the Protestant feeling in the country was stirred. The Bishop knew that as a moderator he was bound to be attacked by both sides. His one endeavour was 'to keep his head clear, and undisturbed by criticism to go on quietly with his efforts to induce a more reasonable temper.' Above all he knew how to keep silence. Neither speeches nor declarations at E.C. U. meetings, nor Sir W. Harcourt's letters in the 'Times,' drew any answer from him. He believed that harm would be done by saying almost anything on the disputed points, and always regretted when he was forced to speak. In his opinion the seriousness of the crisis did not lie so much in itself, but in the fact that the prevalent temper as exhibited in Sir W. Harcourt's letters, and in the nature of the outcry against the extreme men, showed how little the principles of true liberalism had penetrated into the common life, since people were so anxious to withhold from others the liberty which they claimed for themselves. He was grieved

in his dealings with individuals to find how little prepared they often were to give up their own way for the general good. He realised painfully how character deteriorates in those who persuade themselves that their own way is the only right way. As he wrote: 'the worst of religious or political fanaticism is that people talk so much about trifles and grow so heated that they do not know the depths to which they descend.' It will be readily understood what it meant to one whose position made him keenly alive to the great and pressing needs of the Church, to be constantly turned aside from the great work which he wanted to do by difficulties which seemed infinitely small, even though their effect might be far-reaching. But he never lost courage. Those who could understand always felt 'that his strong hand was on the helm' and that his clear eye studied the prospect. His patience never wore out, he always kept a firm hold on the main issues, his clear common sense might be irritating to angry controversialists, but most were constrained to recognise his desire to be just, and encouraged by his confidence in the future of the Church.

A new incident added fuel to the flame. A certain foolish young man had taken to confession against the wishes of his parents. Neither the parents nor the curate to whom the young man had gone had behaved with wisdom. The result was a correspondence published in the newspapers, and another attack in the House of Lords on indifferent bishops and lawless clergy. The Bishop refused to be drawn into a discussion of the whole policy of the Church, and whilst stating clearly that anything like the introduction of the system of confession into the Church of England must be very carefully guarded against, he asserted that in his opinion there was no need whatever for any really serious anxiety upon that point. He must have wished to show the Lords that it was perhaps beneath their dignity to concern themselves so particularly about the nature of a book given by a curate to a boy, when, after telling how he had remonstrated with the curate for giving away a book written by a member of another communion, he added: 'What should we say supposing a clergyman had picked up a book written by an eminent nonconformist minister and given it to the boy?' He concluded by saying

that the father of the boy had thanked him for the promptness and kindness with which he had dealt with the matter, and that the curate had accepted his admonitions and promised in the future not to receive persons under age to confession.

The following letter shows his views about confession :

‘ March 7, 1899.

‘ The practice of confession can only become habitual if it is required as a necessary preliminary for the reception of the Holy Communion. This it can never be in the Church of England, and I do not think that the temper of the English people is such that they are ever likely to accept it voluntarily to any large extent. I consider that its general adoption would show a weakening of the moral fibre of the English character.’

After an interview with one of his clergy, he wrote :

‘ February 27, 1899.

‘ Let me put on record my requests to you this morning.

‘ (1) That you should not give to candidates for Confirmation any literature concerning Confession.

‘ (2) That you should not urge upon them Confession as a preliminary for Confirmation.

‘ (3) That you should not give them any teaching on the subject beyond what is contained in the book of Common Prayer.’

When the difficulty of carrying out these injunctions literally was expressed, he wrote again :

‘ March 8, 1899.

‘ The teaching of the Church of England about preparation for Holy Communion is clear. It prescribes—

‘ (1) Self-examination.

‘ (2) Confession to God.

‘ (3) Restitution and satisfaction to man.

‘ This is universal, but if anyone cannot quiet his own conscience, he may come for advice and absolution.

‘ The important point is that the last course should be left to the individual who chooses to use it.

‘ No clergyman in preparing candidates for Confirmation may teach that the exceptional method is normal. It is one thing to awaken the conscience, it is another thing to undertake to quiet it for someone else.’

Early in March he sent this memorandum to all the churches in the diocese which it might concern :

‘ Services in Holy Week.

‘ I am not prepared to sanction,

‘ (1) The washing of the altars.

‘ (2) The Adoration of the Cross.

‘ (3) The benediction of the paschal candle.

‘ I do not forbid the *distribution* of palms, provided it be not part of any other service ; and the prayers used are for a blessing of the people, not of the palms, which are to be used as memorials. The palms are not to be sprinkled or censured.’

When asked by a friend not to press these directions too closely on a particular priest, he answered :

‘ London House : March 13, 1899.

‘ I am glad to see ——’s letters. I quite sympathise with him. But all these people make one mistake. They believe that it is their excrescences which make them succeed, whereas it is *themselves*. The people like —— and would take anything *he* did, because he does it. If he were to say, “ I have been doing things which I liked, and which I thought you would like. The Bishop tells me that it is not good for the general welfare of the Church that these things should be done. Let us drop them quietly for the good of our brethren. We can do just as well without them ”—then he would be setting an example which would be of great value. But unfortunately the English mind has no grasp of ideas, and no sense of proportion. Indeed the Englishman has no mind at all, he only has an hereditary obstinacy.

‘ About your question, I wish to give as few directions as possible. My memorandum was a circular to whom it might concern. I had before me a number of services for the “ Blessing of Palms.” Their childishness and absence of intelligibility was portentous. Scarcely any two were the same. Doubtless they all came from ancient sources, which were not applicable, and were not properly translated. Many of them maundered about a “ creature of palms,” which is ridiculous. Of course it was a translation of “ creatura palmarum ” which means “ palms the work of Thy Hands ” or some such phrase.

‘ Then many were exorcisms of the “ creature of palms,” which involved unspeakable nonsense. Others prayed that the palms so blessed might exorcise the houses to which they were carried. They all pointed in one direction—that an

archæological revival was being carried out in the most stupid way without any regard to circumstances, or ideas, or any conception of truth.

‘I thought it best to give a general direction, and take no further step about details. I do not think that the form you send me is open to the criticisms expressed above. I remember Palm Sunday observed in the country by people as you say. But we have before us a general question as to the latitude for imaginative services, and this must be judged with reference to their simplicity and directness. The rule must be: Take the idea and apply it sensibly to the people with whom you are dealing. Appeal to the imagination must not degrade knowledge.

‘I still see no light on the situation generally. No one cares to define it accurately, or prescribe limits. The identification of what you have been in the habit of doing with the “Catholic Faith” is a conspicuously English way of talking nonsense.’

To the Bishop of Bombay (Dr. McArthur, now Bishop of Southampton)

‘Brunnen, Switzerland : April 10, 1899.

‘My dear Bishop,—I have been long in answering your letter, but that is not the test of my gladness at receiving it. In the daily accumulation of my correspondence that which presses is dealt with first, and what can wait, waits. I remember the Archbishop saying to me, “You will find it a good maxim, Never do to-day what you can put off till to-morrow : but then you must be sure what can be put off.” I find it necessary to act on that principle. Now, however, I am taking a holiday for a few days at Easter. I find that I can go for three months, and then I must have a little rest. It is well to learn one’s possibilities. The advantage of getting away and lifting one’s head out of the eternal sound of machinery is really most beneficial. I can go back to work again with kindly feelings towards everyone ; which is an absolutely essential part of a bishop’s work, to my thinking. If a man, or a parish or a question, gets on your nerves, you are useless for that purpose. . . . Church matters generally are as bad as can be. I do not see the way out of the present mess. The E.C.U. people have no common sense : and the other people are so violent that the moderates do not like to throw over the E.C.U. The only hope is that the arguments before the Archbishops may clear up some points, and that the decision may be generally received. I am not sure that there will not be a secession. I rather think it

inevitable. We must do all we can to minimise it and make it unreasonable. But a very little matter would precipitate a vast mass of popular opinion into wrathful determination to deal vigorously, and then there would be a general mess. It is not an easy matter for me to keep the peace.'

On April 18, the diocesan conference opened. His presidential address¹ was a lucid statement of the difficulties of the moment, and was felt to be a real help to 'clear thought, where clear thought was so much needed.'

He first spoke sadly of the offence that a time of controversy was to the great body of humble and pious souls 'who are inexpressibly pained at violent speech about holy things, at quarrels among professing Christians, at the suspension of good works for barren disputation, at the exhibition of self-will, by those whom they wish to reverence.' He said that little had 'been done to make the issue clear,' and 'that almost everything had been neglected which practical wisdom could dictate.' In the late controversy the Christian religion had been 'apparently identified with certain adjuncts to the mode of performing divine service ;' and it is 'the extraordinary want of proportion in defining the questions at issue—a want equally discernible on both sides—which prevents any real progress being made in discussion.' It is natural that 'when a Church is moved with evangelistic zeal so strongly as is the Church of England at the present day, various experiments should be made.' Such experiments require regulation, but inquiry must be 'made patiently without heat and without prejudice.'

He maintained that to call such things 'in any sense a religion is an unpardonable exaggeration. . . . They have their place and their importance, but it is within the sphere of ecclesiastical order, not of religious truth.' There was advantage in diversity, but 'there must be a recognisable type' of services. 'Diversity must have its limits.' He did not deny the seriousness of the anxiety roused by the appearance of clerical insubordination, but he said that this insubordinate spirit was not deep-seated. 'I must say for my part that I have found a very real desire to meet my wishes, and to obey my directions.' He showed how diffi-

¹ Published in *The Church and the Nation*.

cult anything like a rigid adherence to the rubrics was, and that 'it is not so easy to give directions about services which are fair and just—which rest on principles, and not on mere arbitrary preference. . . . It is only by a recognition of principles that we can reach peace. Ceremonies are nothing in themselves, and differences of opinion cannot be composed by attacking ceremonies. It is useless to deal with them as subjects for legal decision. . . . Legal procedure narrows the point at issue, and pronounces an abstract decision concerning that point alone. If men's minds are not satisfied about principles, the special points which can be raised about ceremonies are innumerable.' In conclusion, he said that it was to the promotion of zeal and energy in practical work for saving souls that he would have liked to devote himself.

'But we cannot always choose for ourselves the sphere of our activities. If I have to interfere in small matters, if I seem to check zeal and curb enthusiasm, if I have to ask my clergy to pause, and think about the relation of their own particular position to the whole Church, it is because such things are necessary, not because I take pleasure in doing them.

'But I would say this. I do not wish to command so much as to persuade. I wish to induce people to see themselves as others see them, to regard what they are doing in reference to its far-off effects on the consciences of others, to cultivate a truer sense of the proportion of things, to deal more with ideas than with the clothing of ideas; to pay more attention to the reason of a thing than to its antiquity; to remember that the chief danger which besets those who are pursuing a high object is to confuse means with ends; to examine themselves very fully, lest they confuse Christian zeal with the desire to have their own way, which is the characteristic of the natural man.

'I do not like to speak about myself. But we have reached a point where someone must be responsible for leading, and a leader must be trusted. There is no leader possible save the bishop. So I ask you all, clergy and laity alike, to trust me, and to follow me as far as you possibly can.'

His challenge was taken up. The Earl of Stamford concluded a proposal for a vote of thanks to him with the words 'We have been told that there must be a leader, and the leader must be trusted. My Lord, in the name of those

within, and the multitude outside, these walls, I accept the challenge. You are in this matter our rightful leader. We are content. We trust you. We will follow you.'

On May 1, an address expressing confidence in the archbishops and bishops and signed by ten thousand laymen was presented to the Archbishop. Shortly afterwards the hearing began at Lambeth. The Bishop's engagements did not permit of his continuous presence at Lambeth during the days given up to hearing the arguments on either side, but he was in constant consultation with those who were arguing for him.

To the Rev. W. E. Collins

'Ascension Day, 1899.

'As regards Barbaro,¹ his evidence is valuable, as it is that of the outside observer who was giving information, not of a technical but of an obvious kind, to intelligent outsiders. When you consider the rarity of any account of religious services from that point of view, the document becomes very valuable. Barbaro begins by describing the differences which would strike anyone who went into an English church. There were bells and organs, it is true, but not other things. These are things the absence of which would at once be noted: "non acqua, non fuoco;" the language is popular; and must be explained from the motive of the writer. There was no holy water; there was no fire. What is fire? not lights, for he would have said "lumi." What then? There can be nothing but incense, which *is* a fire composed not of sticks but of spices. I do not know that any Italian dictionary would help. Italian dialects at that time were multitudinous. The Venetian was not the literary dialect, nor was its speech accurate. I have read pages of Venetian papers. They are not literary in any sense. But there is nothing in the ordinary services to which "fuoco" could apply except incense.'

Convocation was occupied this spring with the consideration of a bill framed ten years before by Archbishop Benson for amending the constitution of the ecclesiastical Courts. This bill Archbishop Temple took as a basis for discussion in both Houses of Convocation. Dr. Creighton did not take much part in these discussions. I think he felt the creation of any new ecclesiastical Courts so unlikely that he did not

¹ Barbaro was a Venetian Ambassador. In the true text of his letter, written in May 1551, it is 'non acque non fuochi.'

care to give time and thought to the discussion of ideal schemes. The following is his only written utterance on the matter :

To the Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Temple)

‘ June 1, 1899.

‘ My dear Archbishop,—I incline to think that the best course would be for the Upper House to consider the bill and send it to the Lower House. If the Lower House propose amendments which we are unable to accept, then we may have a conference. If we still do not agree, the joint session may take up the question. After all is done, we will have to decide whether or no it is worth while to bring in the bill.

‘ I must confess that the Lambeth hearing convinced me of a point to which I had been otherwise tending. The bill refers to the whole episcopate the decision of questions of doctrine and *ritual*. Now questions of ritual are not concerned with any principle, but merely with interpretation. I do not see how a meeting of bishops would have acted if the question of incense had been referred to them. Nor do I see anything in the arguments before you which requires anything but legal intelligence.

‘ Now a bishops’ meeting could at most appoint a committee, who would consult experts, and make a report according to their knowledge. If the advocates before the Privy Council had any additional knowledge, they would bring it forward; and the bishops might be convicted of ignorance.

‘ At all events we would give our decision without all the means of knowing which would be at the disposal of the Court to which we reported.

‘ This does not apply to doctrine in which we are experts, and where our decision ought to be authoritative. I do not like putting doctrine and ritual on the same footing.’

The Archbishops’ decision about incense and lights was not issued till August. It was received with dismay by the ritualists, chiefly on account of the grounds on which it was based. It might probably have been generally accepted had it not been based on a rigid interpretation of the Act of Uniformity.¹ The irritation was increased by a letter

¹ In his decision the Archbishop said ‘ Nothing can be clearer than the words used in the Act of 1559 ’ (the second Act of Uniformity) ‘ prohibiting the use of any ceremony not ordered in the book.’ He quoted the passages in the Act

from Sir William Harcourt to the 'Times' welcoming the decision especially because of the grounds on which it was made. It was said that he did his utmost to make disobedience general. Beforehand the very clergy who were known for their extreme practices had expressed their weariness of the agitation and their willingness to obey, but now it became to many a matter of principle to disobey.

The following letters show the Bishop's opinion about some of the points raised in the discussion :

'Llanfairfechan : August 4, 1899

'My dear Dr. Cobb,—I have been reading your communication to the "Westminster." May I make a remark on one point? You say that the Archbishops' decision must necessarily turn many people's minds to a reconsideration of the relations between Church and State. I know that this is the right thing to say—but I also know that you are not the man to say it for that reason. I think that there is something rather discreditable to English common sense in the tendency for everyone who is displeased about matters ecclesiastical to exclaim "Better disestablishment than this!" Everyone seems to think that in a disestablished church his own particular views would undoubtedly prevail. I should like people to think out a little more clearly what would be the state of affairs in a disestablished church. It would be pretty much what it is at present, only rather more so.

'A synod, construct it as you will, would have a stricter conception of uniformity than have the bishops. You would get no changes in the Prayer Book, and no different principles of interpreting rubrics. . . . The fact is that the conservatism of the English people is insuperable. . . . If the Anglican system were put into the melting-pot to-morrow, it would come out after five years' heating precisely the same. If you think otherwise, I should be very glad to be enlightened

prescribing the order of services in the Church and said that they were 'clearly meant to exclude all variations.' He allowed that at first 'the Act was imperfectly obeyed,' but said 'in spite of all this, the precise and clear statements of the Act gradually prevailed, and forbidden ceremonies gradually disappeared.' He went on : 'We are obliged to come to the conclusion that the use of incense in the public worship, and as a part of that worship, is not at present enjoined nor permitted by the law of the Church of England, and it is our duty to request the clergy who do use it to discontinue that use. If used at all, it must be used (in George Herbert's language) to sweeten the church and outside the worship altogether.' The same line of reasoning was applied to the case of processions carrying lights.

—but this is a matter on which we must all try and think straight.’

‘Llanfairfechan : August 9, 1899.

‘Dear Dr. Cobb,—. . . I remember that I was once trying to find a title for a book about English Church history from 1534–1662. I was talking about it to Dr. Hort, who said, “the true title would be *Experiments in Anglicanism*; but that would not do.” This is quite true, and the experiments are not yet finished. There was a lull from 1662 to 1832; now we are in the thick of a period of revision of them. Previous experiments ended in nonconformity of various sorts. Can this be averted now? You propose to try and avert it by disestablishment. Would that succeed? It is a large step to take, fraught with many issues, unless its success is certain. You refuse to regard the Church as “the religious consciousness of the nation.” So would all if that involved any tampering with the faith. But the faith is secure: it is only certain modes of expressing some portions of it which are in question. Ceremonies, exact methods of services, even discipline, are questions which may be settled by the national consciousness. That consciousness is very insular. A statesman may try to think in larger terms, but he has to express himself in forms which that consciousness will accept. A churchman has to do the same. Englishmen have no notion of a form, made elsewhere, into which they must fit themselves. But this is a digression from my point. Suppose the Church was a voluntary society with a synod of three houses. The dominant house would be the laymen. Disestablishment forced on from within would not be popular with the laity. The party which had produced this result would not be strong. It would not meet with much sympathy when the stern facts of finance and organisation had to be faced. Englishmen always act very legally; they would make a broad system, with very little discretion beyond. The ritualists would have to recognise that they must fall in, or go; this would be much more apparent than now. There would be much stricter subordination required. Everything would be much more definite. I am tolerably certain that this would rapidly end in disruption. If this were confined to England, it would be bad enough; but the Anglican communion in the empire would follow in some degree.

‘The fact is that the present state of things is due to a systematic attempt to organise the Church beyond the limits of organisation which Englishmen will endure. The Roman Church has gone on so long that no one understands its system: everybody takes what he likes, and those who do not

like it pay no attention to it. Englishmen are religious ; they have consciences, which the Latin peoples have not in the same degree. The Englishman will only have a system which he understands, and which he purposes to follow. He will have nothing of first-class, second-class, and third-class religion which the Roman Church amply provides for various stages of development.

‘ I am rambling on away from my point, which is, that I think disestablishment would inevitably lead to disruption. It would only alter disadvantageously the present position : and those who had pressed for it in hopes of amending things in their direction could not afford to wait then, as they can without undue loss of dignity afford to wait now.’

‘ Llanfairfechan : August 12, 1899.

‘ Dear Dr. Cobb,— . . I have long felt that there were serious difficulties ahead. The position was that the services of the Church of England as they had existed for three centuries and a half were being changed without any authority, on the ground of development.

‘ But *development* essentially means “ making explicit what was implicit ” and the criterion was the consciousness of the whole body of the Church. The test of development is *unanimity*, or at all events general acceptance. It means a gradual growth of the common consciousness of the religious community. But the ritualists claimed a right to develop by congregations. Further, they claimed to carry the whole Church with them ; and they developed not according to any principle of inward growth, but up to an external standard of the practice of the Western Church.

‘ This is an impossible position.

‘ If we look at facts—they have produced a natural development of more frequent communions, better and more reverent services, greater hold on definite principles and the like. They have altered the whole type of service. But this has been done by making explicit what was implicit in the Prayer Book system.

‘ On these lines progress is possible. But wreckage comes from insisting on developing up to an external standard, which is alien to English ideas. They will not abandon this : they have produced a reaction, which makes things more difficult. Their loss would, as you say, be a disaster to the attempt to educate the English character to finer feeling. It is the duty of everybody who can think, and detach himself from personal feeling, to strive to avert this result. The thing at stake is English Christianity. We can none of us

give it the form which we personally wish. How can we do the best for it?’

‘Llanfairfechan : August 15, 1899.

‘Dear Dr. Cobb,—I quite agree with you—the question is, How are we to get at the Christian communions [community] of the Church?¹ I remember a terrible saying of a wise man : “There has been no *Church* since the end of the third century. There have been two bodies, one offering, the other accepting, Christian privileges.”

‘I will accept your view entirely if you will take it as a dream of the future. Since the triumph of the Church, the ecclesiastical organisation has everywhere gone astray. The Roman Church is the most complete expression of Erastianism, for it is not a church at all, but a state in its organisation, and the worst form of a state—an autocracy.

‘But anyone who has tried knows the difficulty of getting a working representation of the laity for any except a practical purpose. They will work to build or restore a church, to manage its finances, &c. ; but beyond that—? You will say this shows the need of their education. It is going on, I admit, and we may hope for something from it. But the consciousness of the Christian body works quietly, and is to be gathered by other means than by count of heads. It is that consciousness which I try to catch : and I am sure that it is at present perturbed by things which it does not understand in the conduct of the ritualist party. I believe that if they would frankly say, “We think that we have outsped the general wish of the Church ; we are willing to withdraw simply on that ground. Hear us, and give us all you can. We will try to win what we want by argument and teaching, then we will ask again”—I believe that this attitude would produce a reaction in their favour, and would appeal to the sympathy of the English people generally. You will say that it is superhuman. So it is. That is why it would be so powerful.

‘Llanfairfechan : August 22, 1899.

‘Dear Dr. Cobb,—In two days I leave England and abandon correspondence. . . . The practical question is one of tolerance, as you say. But tolerance is not only a moral virtue, it must have an intellectual basis. The question is, How much can be comprehended in the system of the Church of England? I remember a remark of a Frenchman, talking about modern Liberalism : “Ils confondent le droit de

¹ Dr. Cobb had written ‘We want the Christian community as a whole to say what it wants.’

l'individu d'être libre avec la nécessité de l'institution d'être quelque chose." The Church of England may be tolerant, but it must be *something*. I think that the present crisis is more serious than previous ones because it raises that point. The cry, "Why should not congregations do as they like?" really resolves the Church into a loose covering of the religious consciousness, not of the nation, but of small bodies of Christian people, held together by no principle of cohesion but convenience. The tolerance which the extreme people ask for is the right to do whatever they like, irrespective of the organisation to which they belong. They will not try to get what they want by persuading others of its harmlessness, by agitating, by explaining, by moving in Convocation. They take the right to do what they like, and are aggrieved at the narrow-mindedness of those who distrust them. The Bishop of Stepney told me of one to whom he gave the advice to move through Convocation. "Oh," was the answer, "that would be no good: we should get nothing." It is all there; and this attitude is very opposed to the English conceptions of right.

'Did you read a book by a man called Whittuck,¹ which came out some few years ago? Its point was that the High Church party behaved as though they had annexed the Church of England, and that they had not. The book was little read at the time, but it is worth looking at.

'I hope that matters will enter on a phase of reasonable discussion, and a capacity for facing the real problems. Your position is that disestablishment will help this. I am doubtful. It would raise many other questions first, but it would leave the position of present difficulties just as they are now—i.e. the voice of authority would be as it is.'

The Bishop recognised that obedience had been made difficult, still he had to try to secure it, and at the end of August he issued a circular letter to his rural deans:

'Rev. and dear Sir,—You are aware that I referred to the Archbishop of Canterbury the solution of some doubts which were felt by a clergyman in the diocese relative to the ceremonial use of incense, and to the use of lights carried about during the service. The Archbishop, after hearing all that was urged on the subject, has concluded that there is no authority for these usages according to the existing regulations which apply to the conduct of divine worship in the Church of England.

¹ *The Church of England and Recent Religious Thought*, 1893.

‘This being so, it becomes a universal duty to abandon these usages; they are matters which are in no way essential to Christian teaching, and they give offence to many.

‘I know that habit counts for much in all things appertaining to divine worship. But I feel sure that clergy and congregations alike will recognise the duty of obedience to authority, and also the equal duty of not offending their brethren.

‘I should be obliged to you if you would convey to those clergy in your deanery who may have introduced those usages into their services, my request that they will quietly abandon them, and will explain to their people that they do so at my desire. It is the duty of a bishop to consider what is best for the whole body of the Church, and before this general consideration personal preferences must give way.

‘At this season many are away from home, and communications are uncertain, I would ask you to inform me in the first week of October of the results of your action.’

It was generally felt that this letter made submission as easy as possible, and gratitude was expressed for the absence of any allusion to Acts of Parliament, and for the considerate tone of his letter. When he returned to Fulham in the autumn, he found that the great majority of the 58 clergy in the diocese who had used incense or processional lights were willing at his request to give them up. Some of these only gave up the *ceremonial* use of incense, and continued its use before the services. Many stated that they only obeyed under protest, and that they refused to recognise the grounds on which the Archbishop's decision was based, or to consider it binding. Some spoke of the trouble and distress caused to their congregations, and in many cases resolutions of protest, passed at meetings of the congregations affected, were forwarded to the Bishop, as well as largely signed petitions. On the whole, there was willingness to recognise the duty to lay aside individual preferences and follow the Bishop in what he ordered for the good of the whole Church.

To one of those who obeyed the Bishop wrote :

‘Fulham Palace : October 3, 1899.

‘(1) I am thankful to you for your readiness to comply with my request about incense. I would do anything I can

to make it easy to you and your people. But my own position in the matter is prescribed by what has occurred. I asked the Archbishop to decide if its ceremonial use was covered by the regulations which govern the services of the Church of England, and he has answered *No*.

‘(2) My own view is that the *ceremonial* use, for censuring persons and things, is open to objection as giving an unwarranted emphasis to certain portions of the service, and so giving it a meaning which is not strictly its own. If this were clearly avoided, I do not see any ground of objection. But you must remember that people’s minds are very suspicious just now.

‘(3) You ask me the very pertinent question “How far?” The answer depends very much on your side. The real question now raised is the maintenance of the Church of England as it has been accepted by the English people, in *relation to their national life*, during three centuries and a half. Nobody feels any interest in ceremonies, as such, or in doctrines, as such; but they feel that a powerful and useful institution must not be turned into something which it never has been, and which they do not want. Roman ways are suspected because they lead up to the Roman conception of the Church as an organisation created and ruled by the clergy, existing independently of its members, conferring or withholding salvation according as its rules are observed. Now you and others would repudiate this; but we have to consider the furthest consequences of our actions.

‘Priesthood, Sacraments, Confession, all are explicable by themselves. They can be placed in a system which finds room for individual liberty, or in a system which excludes it. But it makes a great difference how the system shapes itself. Do not let us make a mistake. The question to be decided is, How much of the results of the Oxford movement are to be permanently incorporated into the Anglican system? The answer is, from my point of view: As much as is compatible with the maintenance of that system as founded on a view of the Church which safeguards liberty.

‘You speak of your people and their wishes. Of course they are attached to what is, and few of them would think of the general issue. Let me give you a quotation from a letter of a High Churchman: “The Eucharist is simply weighed down to the earth with the most tedious, unmeaning, and paltry symbolism; indeed it is not the Church of England service at all, but utterly changed. I and scores of others put up with it because we are not grumblers, but think the nonsense we have to tolerate is beyond all reason.”

'It is opinions such as these that weigh with bishops. It is unfortunate that you cannot deal with a *temper* except by dealing with externals of small moment in themselves. If the temper were laid aside, the externals would not matter.

'I already note a growing change of temper; if this goes on, peace will come. But it must be through the acceptance of the Anglican and not the Roman view of the Church.'

He replied as follows to some criticisms on the Archbishop's decision :

To Mr. Robert Bickersteth

'Fulham Palace, S.W. : October 3, 1899.

'... You say "the Archbishop's decision surrenders the 'principle of continuity in our worship.'" I should not like *continuity* to depend on the same external ceremonies. If the dropping of a ceremony breaks continuity, surely its introduction does so equally. You can only get continuity of development, and development may be up or down—to more or less.

'... 'Then do you think that the regulations concerning the conduct of divine worship ought to be altered by each congregation at will? I must own that I think the scorn heaped on the interpretation of an Act of Parliament is misplaced, and is empty of meaning. All regulations about everything are binding till they are altered. They can be altered by the same authority that made them. They *are* altered when people are agreed to wish to have them altered. All interpretation of anything is rigid as soon as circumstances demand strict interpretation; and this becomes necessary so soon as their meaning is challenged.

'We may wish that the evidence had allowed the Archbishop to decide otherwise, but I think it rather unfair that a movement which has been carried on for forty years on the plea of a particular interpretation of the Ornaments Rubric—which argued its case at length on that ground—should, when its interpretation was proved untenable, denounce rigid interpretation of particular points and wish to substitute general principles.

'It is quite obvious that incense could never have been introduced into the English Church except on the plea that it was covered by the Ornaments Rubric. Is it fair to sneer at the care taken to try this particular issue?

'Forgive me if I write thus to you: but I think that at present we must all try to be scrupulously fair.'

‘ Fulham Palace, S.W. : October 9, 1899.

‘ You will forgive me for troubling you with one reflection which I have for a long had before me. The conception of “continuity” which has been very prominent of late years needs definition more than it has received.

‘ There is continuity

‘ (1) of faith,

‘ (2) of ecclesiastical organisation,

‘ (3) of the Sacraments as ordained by Christ.

‘ This is the framework of the Church.

‘ But all else springs from the Church’s conception of its office as teacher. Ceremonies are modes of teaching. They have reference to the work to be done, and the best way of doing it. In the sixteenth century the system of the Church had grown so complicated that it had ceased to act as a teacher. The Reformation in England was an attempt to bring that system back to its early simplicity and connexion with the life of men. That attempt dealt only with what was avowedly experimental and not essential. “Continuity” was not affected by local “uses.” These uses may be changed by consent of the Church, but not by individual congregations.

‘ Personally I think that the English people are insular in their opinion about politics, society and religion alike. But I cannot change them by running counter to their views all at once. I am born an Englishman, and have to make the best of it.’

Three London incumbents wrote to the Bishop to say decidedly that they were unable to obey his injunctions. Eighteen others asked for an interview with him, in order that they might, if possible, bring the accustomed use of incense in their churches into accord with his wishes.

He met them at London House on October 16. One of them read a statement that they could not accept the Archbishop’s opinion on the use of incense, nor the argument upon which it was based, as having any authority over them, but that they desired to know the Bishop’s wishes, so that they might if possible conform to them. After hearing their views the Bishop said that his wish was that they should give up the ceremonial use of incense between the Lord’s Prayer and the Benediction. He explained the ceremonial use of incense to mean the censuring of persons and things.

He said that whilst unable to *sanction* the use of incense in processions before and after the service, he would not object to it. After conference together these eighteen clergy wrote to the Bishop :

‘ We the undersigned desire to express our sincere gratitude for the kindness and sympathy shown to us by your lordship on the occasion of our interview on the 16th instant and for the liberty granted us to state freely our conscientious difficulties caused by our interpretation of your letter to the rural deans.

‘ Having heard from your lordship that such a measure of acquiescence as includes the use of the censer before the service of Holy Communion in the Prayer Book, together with the use of incense in processions before or after the service, is agreeable to you, we are accordingly prepared to modify our practice by suspending for the present in our several churches the customary ceremonial use of incense (by which we understand the censuring of persons and things) during the service as set out in the Prayer Book. But we beg to remind your lordship that such a modification of the accustomed use is made without any reference on our part to the Archbishop’s opinion, the binding authority of which we have felt it our duty respectfully to deny, and the reasons of which as stated we have ventured in our letter of the 16th instant definitely to repudiate.

‘ We would explain that we make this alteration solely in compliance with the wish of our diocesan, and in dutiful regard for his person and office, and for the good of the Church. Neither would we hide from your lordship that such an alteration, however temporary, can only be made at what will be felt by our congregations to be a great loss, and at the risk of causing considerable misunderstanding, and irritation, after, as in some cases, so many years of undisturbed enjoyment of what we believe to be our rightful liberty, not forbidden by the Prayer Book.’

In his interview with these eighteen priests, the Bishop had asked them to try to persuade the three who had declined to consider any concession, to come into line with them. This they undertook to do, but without success.

The Bishop then asked these three priests to meet him, and they talked over the matter in a frank and friendly spirit. It was a cause of serious annoyance to him that incorrect statements as to what was said during this conversation

got into the newspapers. In answer to an inquiry as to the truth of these reports, he wrote :

‘ Fulham Palace : November 11, 1899.

‘ I had a private and perfectly friendly talk last Monday with Wainwright, Harry Wilson and Middleton Evans, in the course of which we talked quite freely of possibilities. Amongst other things we discussed what would happen in case a prosecution was instituted by me, and I explained what I conceived to be the course which such procedure might assume.

‘ This is now represented as a threat on my part that I would do so. It is worth while noting that the difficulty of a Bishop of London in dealing in a friendly way with his clergy is enormous. If he writes a letter, it is at once forwarded to the E.C.U. office, is filed for everyone to see, and he is said to have “sanctioned” universally something which in a particular case he is prepared to overlook.

‘ If he has a friendly talk, it is at once misrepresented in any form from which most capital may be made.’

There is no doubt that the Bishop’s behaviour during this particular interview was quite informal ; he even allowed himself to make a joke. He was urging his hearers to give up what seemed to him a matter of personal preference for the sake of peace, when one of them said, ‘ But, my Lord, you must remember that we have a cure of souls.’ To which came the quick reply, ‘ And you think that souls, like herrings, cannot be cured without smoke.’ This remark no doubt gave offence. When he told me of it, and I said, ‘ You ought not to have said that,’ he answered, ‘ Yes, I know I ought not, but it was irresistible.’

This first interview led to nothing, but though he had little hope, he determined to try again. He suggested that this first attempt at an understanding should be treated as if it had not taken place, and that they should begin again. In reply to a request to state on what basis the discussion should take place, he wrote :

‘ Fulham Palace, S.W. : November 22, 1899.

‘ My dear Mr. Wilson,—As matters stand it is not in my power to sanction in any form the continued use of incense during divine service. It would be useless to discuss that point with a view to concessions. I frankly admit that I do not understand the importance which you attach to a cere-

mony which may be regarded as edifying by some, but is disliked by many more.

‘My difficulty is to know why, for the sake of such a matter, you should lay aside all considerations of the duty of obedience to ecclesiastical authority, and of the welfare of the general body of the Church of which you are an officer.

‘The words which you quote from my letter “My object was to obtain from you something other than that” meant that I could not conceive that clergymen could be satisfied by answering a request from their Bishop by the simple statement that they did not propose to pay any attention to it. I still do not think that you want the matter merely to rest there.’

Unfortunately the second interview suggested no way out of the difficulty, and the Bishop sadly realised that for the time there was nothing to be done but to leave these priests alone, and refrain from visiting their churches whilst they persisted in disobedience.

The beliefs upon which his whole life was built made him shrink from prosecution; and besides his abhorrence of anything which could look like persecution, he felt that prosecution could not help to permanent peace. He was sure that bishops could not prosecute their clergy without losing their influence, and that heroic measures would never lead to victory.

Some of the thoughts raised by the agitating questions of this year were expressed to a meeting of the Committee for Church Defence and Church Instruction in November:

‘The Church needs no defence, it only needs to be understood—its only foe is ignorance. . . . In ecclesiastical matters we have two definite and strongly marked parties and I do not think that these two parties ever grasp, with any exactness, the great line of distinction between them. That distinction is this: There is one party which maintains the ancient organisation of the Church as necessary, and there is another which maintains that all forms of organisation are equally good, and are to be chosen simply on motives of convenience. . . . This is the one point which differentiates nonconformists from members of the Church. . . . It is obvious that those who take the nonconformist point of view should have an altogether different conception of the relation of the Church to the State, of the Church to society, and

of the Church to the individual, than we have. . . . It is quite natural that the nonconformists should wish to separate the Church from the State, that they should wish, that is to say, that there should be no religious body which is supposed in any way to express the sentiments of the English more than any other. That is the real point at issue. . . . A national church means a national recognition of the supreme law of God. Without a national church there cannot be that. In this ancient Christian land, in this country where the State has been educated by the Church, where civilisation was begun by the Church, where to understand any institution whatever one has to go to ecclesiastical history to find its origins, such a breach with the past would be irreparable, though it would not damage the Church as much as it would the State, and it is the State I am thinking of. I am not ashamed to own that I am an Englishman first and a Churchman afterwards; . . . but to my mind Church and State are not contradictory things. Church and State are the nation looked at from different points of view. The nation looked at from the secular side is the State, looked at from the religious side it is the Church, and separation between the two is impossible. The great danger which besets the modern State is that it should be so engrossed in the details of the vast business which it has to carry on as to lose sight of leading principles.

. . . If the State were to cut itself adrift from the Church, it would drop into the position of a committee which had only to do with business and did not concern itself with principles. I do not want to see the State belittled in this manner. . . . I am quite clear that there is no chance of disestablishment being carried in England in any time that I can foresee by attacks from without; unless these attacks are welcomed from within. A feature of the English character is the determination of the Englishman to have his own way, simply because it is his own way, and to declare that the institutions by which he is governed must be changed to enable him to have his own way. . . . There is a danger at present lest disestablishment should be regarded as a panacea for all grievances, and lest everybody who is aggrieved at not getting his own way should go in for disestablishment because by it he feels sure he will get his own way. . . . People speak as if they wished to purge the Church of England by turning out everybody who does not think as they do; but then comes the question where are those who are turned out to go? . . . Do we want any more small bodies outside the Church all flying at one another's throats? Is that the ideal of Christianity?

CHAPTER XII

THE LONDON CHURCH CONGRESS

HAVING followed the course of the ritual controversy to the end of 1899, we must now consider the other events of that year. In January the Bishop lectured at the Midland Institute in Birmingham on the History of Universities. In the course of his lecture he spoke of the future development of the new universities, pointing out how important it was that they should respond to local needs. But he added,

‘it is also important that a university should be independent, that it should be self-governing, in the hands mainly of its own teachers. A locality may create a university, but once created it must commit its guidance to experts, for it cannot possibly hope to control it from outside, and it must not make it absolutely subservient to mere local demands. A university, however local it may be, must be in some degree the home of research, and not merely a training place for particular employments. It must be a place where the highest knowledge is pursued for the sake of knowledge. The object of a university is that it should be the testing place of all ideas as they are framed, and that it should appraise them and put its stamp upon them, before they filter through to the public mind. . . . The influence of ideas, the value of ideas, depend on the power of accurate thinking possessed by those men who submit ideas to others.’

To his nephew Basil

‘February 14, 1899.

‘On Saturday night I went to Eton and lectured to the boys. This was rather a naughty thing of me to do, for I had many other things : but some time ago the head of the school wrote and asked me. As the request came from the boys, and not from the Master, I tried to find a day. The boys manage their own lectures there in an amusing fashion.’

He found the Eton boys a delightful audience, and talked to them for an hour about Russia. During this year

he had what he described as 'evil days, difficult business and many bores.' But he did not allow himself to be absorbed by ritual difficulties. The moral condition of London was much in his thoughts, and he readily joined in a scheme first suggested by Mr. Compton Ricketts, M.P., to create a Council for the Promotion of Public Morality in London. The object of this council is to secure the co-operation of all those who desire to do something to promote purer morals in London, whatever their religious or political opinions may be, or even whatever opinions they may hold about the methods to be pursued to attain their object. The Bishop regularly attended the committee meetings which were held to start this new society, and on February 1, 1900, he presided at its first public meeting in St. Martin's Town Hall. He said that, though unable to refuse the request that he should act as president of the council for a time, it was his hope that it would be only for a time, and that the work in the future would be organised on a lay basis; the less the clergy had to do with it the better. He described the aims of the council as plain, practical and businesslike. Their hope was to cope with organised temptations to immorality: 'The organised co-operation of public opinion in such a country as ours is the most potent means of redressing wrongs. It is for the purpose of organising and calling forth public opinion, and applying it to this particular problem, that our new society has been formed.' The first resolution in support of the council was moved by the Roman Catholic Bishop of Southwark and seconded by the Chief Rabbi. All speakers alike testified to their willingness to work under the Bishop's leadership to bring about a purer London.

He had long believed that Homes and Refuges of all kinds ought to be regularly inspected, and until some general method of inspection should be arranged, he appointed a committee of his own, consisting of men and women of experience, to visit such Homes in his diocese as would receive them, and to report to him. The Bishop's Visiting Committee, as it was called, was universally welcomed and supplied with every information. It inspected the different institutions in accordance with detailed regulations drawn

up under the Bishop's supervision, and submitted a careful report to him. He treated the whole matter as confidential; the report was for him alone. On the whole, he was satisfied with the result of the inspection, and besides writing specially to some institutions he issued a general letter of recommendations based on the reports received, which shows how carefully he had gone into the matter.

It was announced early this year that two of the leading London daily papers contemplated bringing out a Sunday issue. The Bishop was readily persuaded to use his influence to prevent this. He felt that the position of seven-days newspapers was altogether different from that of the regular Sunday papers which were mainly prepared during the last three days of the week, and sold by the tobacconists and others, who anyhow kept their shops open on Sundays. It was chiefly in the interests of the larger newsagents who prefer to close on Sundays and who would lose regular customers if they refused to supply the Sunday issue of a seven-days paper, that he took up the matter. He spoke of it at his diocesan conference, and attended a deputation to the Home Secretary about it. But it was probably the influence which he exerted privately that was the strongest. On May 24 he wrote to his niece, 'I had to console —, proprietor of the —, who has given up his Sunday issue. I wrote and implored him to do so, and he came to explain his motives, and said that he had reluctantly agreed.'

In June he spoke in the House of Lords in favour of the Lord Chief Justice's 'Prevention of Corruption Bill.' He said that had the bill dealt only with commercial morality, he would not have ventured to speak on it, 'but it concerns all pecuniary dealings between man and man. It deals with a practice which taints almost everything men are able to do one with another. It deals with a mischief the principle of which is that no money is to be passed from one person to another without some of it sticking to the fingers of everyone who touches it.' He showed how easily the system of gratuities led to blackmailing. But he fully recognised the difficulty of putting it down by legislation.

'It is quite true that a man cannot be made virtuous by Acts of Parliament, but at least evils can be removed from

his path, and it can be made more possible for him to be virtuous than vicious. One function of the law at all events is that it should express the public conscience, and so break down corrupt conventions. . . . These conventions cannot be attacked by legislation until they have reached a point at which they are ready to fall, and I venture to think that these conventions of trade have reached a point when they are ready to fall if a sufficient impulse is given. . . . Trade custom in itself is very hard to contend against. It is not so much a regulation or a habit as an atmosphere in which ordinary morality has often to be abandoned, frequently with a sigh on the part of those who abandon it. . . . When a man is in a position to say, "You are asking me to commit a misdemeanour for which you and I can be imprisoned," the position becomes entirely different.'

After the Lent confirmations we went for a fortnight to the Lake of Lucerne with our two eldest sons.

'I am feeling happy at the prospect of a holiday,' he wrote on March 26. 'I want to get my mind at rest a little from the worries of controversy, which are always with me. . . . It is very difficult for me to keep the peace, and I have to act very warily, which is a tiresome process.'

To his niece Winifred

'Brunnen : March 30, 1899.

'I think that this lake is the most beautiful I know for hill slopes. The Swiss lakes do not equal the Italian lakes in colouring ; but the architecture of the mountains is finer. I wonder if you have yet learned to judge form and colour separately. The great difference of judgment lies in this. People like different things and do not know why : the reason is that one is thinking of form and another of colour. I always take in the lines of anything first : that is the really intellectual part of any impression because it appeals to the mind : the colour only appeals to the senses and is a matter of feeling. Of course I feel the colour also, and like to feel it : but that is another matter.

April 7.

'I go on thinking about the Easter Collect, that "as by Thy special grace preventing us Thou hast put into our minds good desires, so by Thy continual help we may bring the same to good effect." It seems to me such a beautiful way of making the Resurrection a reality to us : we too must rise, and there is in each of us a life which is struggling to rise, if we would only ask God to give us grace to let it

rise. . . . My holiday is really nice, but I am writing an address which I have to give when I go back, to my diocesan conference. . . .

‘Everyone wishes to be understood : that ought to be the bottom of our prayers : “I go to talk to God because He understands me.”’

‘I suppose that the book of Renan which you are reading is “*Mes Mémoires*.” It is beautifully written . . . but Frenchmen are very curious people, hard for us to understand. They are always rather vain and self-conscious. They claim for their individual self more than we can allow. An Englishman always thinks of himself as a member of society, the Frenchman thinks of himself as a detached person. He tells how he thought and felt, and how he tried to realise his thoughts and feelings. We always try to tell how we discovered what was our duty and how we tried to do it.’

On his way home, he paused at Lucerne to dedicate the new English church there, and also went to Zürich to hold a Confirmation. After reaching London he wrote, ‘I do not find myself that taking a holiday makes it any nicer to come back to work. There seems to be such an enormous amount ; and after being free from worries I think one feels them more just at first.’

The diocesan conference was held for the first time this year in the great hall of the Church House, an innovation which proved a great improvement. I have already spoken of the Bishop’s opening address, in so far as it dealt with the ritual controversy. He did not consider this a subject fitted for general discussion. ‘Christian life still runs its usual course. . . . Many a clergyman has said to me, “I read in the newspapers of a crisis in the Church ; but it does not affect me or my parish. . . .” While great questions are being discussed we still have to live our daily life : and sometimes we find in it greater refreshment because of the confused shouting which fills our ears outside.’

In closing a discussion on the need of paying more attention to preaching, he said :

‘There is a real danger at the present day that sermons may be neglected. That arises very much from the greater amount of parochial energy that is displayed ; but I think that every clergyman ought to remember that, besides being

an organiser and being fertile in good works, he is, after all, primarily a teacher, and no substitution of other things can make up for a deficiency in that which must always be his main object. I would only quote one criticism about sermons, which I remember sunk deeply into my mind, by a layman, which was, "That sermon was more clever than it did me good." That contains a good deal that is worth meditating on. The main object of our sermons ought to be to do some soul good, and no substitution of cleverness, no capacity for talking about current affairs, nothing in the wide world can make up for the absence of a direct simplicity of aim in giving gospel teaching to those who require it.'

The usual succession of meetings, dinners, public functions, sermons, lectures, confirmations, filled these early summer months. Time had to be found for some society engagements. 'So you see I am very gay,' he wrote. 'But it is hard work, and there is not much to be got out of it. People who are not in it want to be in, and those who are in are slightly bored with the trouble I seem to be always talking.'

To G. H.

'May 13, 1899.

'Would you like a record of my doings yesterday? I wrote letters till 11.10. Then I had a Confirmation at 11.30, at one I went on a deputation to the Home Secretary and addressed him about Sunday newspapers. Then I hastened to lunch with the American Ambassador, where I sat between the Marquess of Lansdowne and Mr. Goschen. Then I went to a meeting of Waifs and Strays, where I was in the chair. Then to a meeting of the London University Commission, which lasted till 6.30. Then I went to dinner with Mr. Asquith, and met the Duke of Devonshire and Mr. Balfour. That was pretty violent.'

At Whitsuntide we spent a few days with the Howard Peases in Northumberland.

To his son Cuthbert

'Arcot Hall : May 22, 1899.

'Dearest Cuthbert,—We are in Northumberland taking a holiday. It is cold and wet, and Northumberland looks very grim. . . . However, I have had a good deal of sleep and no letters, and that is all I want. The world has lately been particularly busy for me : indeed I never have had so much to do as since my return from Switzerland.

'I am very much interested in your letters, and am so glad that you like it.¹ There is nothing in life except to enjoy what one is doing. It is the only secret of happiness. But at starting anything it is well to keep a clear eye on one's experience, and separate what is due to one's own feelings from what is in the nature of the thing. This prevents disappointment and keeps one's head cool. Boys are queer creatures. They look one thing from inside and another from outside. Try and keep before yourself as much as possible the sense of your own feelings as a boy. It is odd that there is nothing which one forgets so soon as the experience which one has just passed through. One seems to resent the memories of one's former state. The butterfly hates to be reminded of the grub and the chrysalis. The one secret of teaching is to give an impulse which may induce the taught to be willing to learn. It is no good dragging boys through a process the meaning of which they do not understand. All depends on getting them to lend themselves to the process. The only way to this is to show them knowledge as a living, operative thing, by bringing it into connexion with something which they see and feel. This you discover by casting about: the same point of attachment does not fit everybody. . . . Gemma is with us: and the children are clamouring that I should tell them a story. Tomorrow we go back to Fulham, and I have to spend Wednesday in commemorating the Queen's Birthday. Then there comes Ordination. So wags the world.'

To G. H.

'June 21, 1899.

'I am so busy that I never heard of your visit to Fulham. It is very nice now, but I have little time to see it. Yesterday I left at 7.45 A.M. and returned at 11.30 P.M. This morning I left at 9.30 and shall not return at all, but sleep in London House, where I have a dinner to all the bishops.'

No wonder he wrote on July 18 'How I long for the peace of Wales! . . . Everything seems flat and unprofitable. . . . I am trying to wind up things, which is weary work.'

We spent the three first weeks of August with children and nephews and nieces at Llanfairfechan. Then we went to the Alps, staying first at Pralognan and crossing the Little St. Bernard to Courmayeur. He enjoyed the mountain walks more than ever and studied the architecture of

¹ He had just begun work as a schoolmaster.

the mountains and the lie of the valleys, and planned many future excursions to remote spots.

He was anxious to study the castles in the Val d'Aosta and wrote to Count Balzani: 'I have been seeing several castles in Wales, which you remember was occupied by Edward I. in the great period of castle-building. I rather have castles on the brain.' At Aosta we were joined by Count Balzani and his daughters.

After driving through the Val d'Aosta and visiting some of its splendid castles, we settled down with the Balzanis in their little villa near Ivrea. This second visit only increased his sense of the rare beauty and charm of the district.

To his daughter Beatrice

'Ivrea: September 21, 1899.

'Dearest B.,—I have had ups and downs as regards health, but am now much better. I have written my Church Congress paper, and am peacefully awaiting that ordeal. You have been having a good time in visits. I think that it is very good for all of you to have a time that sets you each on your own feet for a little time. It is good for everybody to try and find themselves. Of course we are always busy with that process, but a change of surroundings makes one doubt about one's old views, and reveals possibilities of error. I am sorry that ——— thinks that he does not understand me. I always think that I am too much of a child of nature and say and do just what suggests itself to me. When he says that he does not understand me, I suppose he means by *me*, me in relation to himself. Well, relationships have to be made or changed from both sides. I may not be good enough in inviting confidence—of that I cannot judge, it is a matter in which one never knows oneself—but I am always receptive, I think, and responsive, and anybody who likes can take me in such form as they want. I think that I have for my motto "Barkis is willing." The objection to me might be taken that I too habitually did the job which came in the way, instead of seeking for the best job to do. But I dare say all this only shows my ignorance of myself. As life goes on my conclusion is that in one sense everybody is quite easy to understand, and in another sense everybody is very difficult to understand—easy to understand as a member of the outward order of things, having a place and functions in the world—very impossible even to think of as a member of the eternal order of things. But any human being who becomes visible to one in that latter aspect is of enormous interest.

And there is no account to be given of the reason why any particular person becomes so visible. And there is no relation whatever between the aspect of a person in the second and in the first of these classes. This is wandering into large subjects. . . . I agree with you in finding the "great" American writers rather thin: Hawthorne seems to me the one man of genius they have in literature. The rest are careful studies of the right thing. Only you must not say so in America. They are a young people, and have all the defects of youth; but their thought seems to me raw; they substitute gush for real perception; they have not yet an adequate amount of national experience behind them.

'We are outside all the popular opinion in England. . . . It is well sometimes to consider the value of public opinion as applied to a particular subject. I don't like war with the Transvaal. It may be a short cut to great schemes, but we are great enough to wait.'

The Ordination on October 8 was followed by the opening of the Church Congress on the 10th.

The work of preparing for the congress had been got through by the Bishop with his usual rapidity. The Editor of the congress Report wrote: 'From the earliest stages of preparation, criticism was disarmed by the prompt and energetic way with which the work was done. The initial steps, often deferred until the new year, were passed before Christmas. Subjects were fixed, and invited speakers secured by the end of January; and the programme was issued months before the usual time.' The Albert Hall had been taken for the congress, and an American sounding board in the shape of a shell was procured which added greatly to the carrying power of the voice. It was decided to have no sectional meetings, except during the mass meeting for working-men in the Albert Hall. An unprecedented number of tickets was sold, and a fortnight before the congress opened all further applications had to be refused, as 8,000 tickets had been issued, and all the seats were numbered and appropriated.

On Monday, October 9, there was a mass meeting for women in the afternoon and for girls in the evening. The Bishop presided at both. To the women he spoke about their husbands and the need of studying their tempers so as to avoid the quarrels 'which do so much to degrade and

debase the whole of life.' 'The great cement of family life is cheerfulness, contentedness and good humour; it is a quiet peaceful disposition which makes you useful to husband and children. . . . Your husband has to be taken care of, just as much as your youngest baby. . . . Hand in hand together you and he have to go through life. This can only be done by remembering that all other relationships take their meaning from the relationship of your own soul to God.'

To the girls who crowded the vast hall in the evening, he said 'The charm of young people is eternal, because it is the source of our hopes for the future, it expresses in the clearest form what we ourselves look forward to, what we labour for, and what we strive for;' he urged them to be willing to learn at least a little from their elders. 'Your father and mother have much to tell you, and although you have much to tell them, yet remember that you are not so wise that you can entirely sit in the seat of the teacher, and simply distribute wisdom without getting some in return. . . . You have a great deal to learn in your home, and should never be in too great a hurry to emancipate yourself from the discipline of home. . . . Your parents know the difference between immediate pleasure and lasting happiness, and what they wish for you is that the cheerfulness and brightness which come naturally to the young life should go with you always.'

To his niece Winifred

'October 12, 1899.

'I told them [the girls at the Congress] how much they could do for older people by taking them into their confidence. I made a quotation, which I pass on to you.

For it fills the old man's heart with joy
And makes his pulses fly
To catch the thrill of a happy voice
And the light of a merry eye.

'What one longs for is, that the happiness of youth should stay and last. Advancing age seems to rob one of it. The joy of life, the longings, the desires for pleasure, for enjoyment, soon pass away unless they have an abiding centre in God, Who is the source of true joy, and Who ever renews our life and gives us new pleasure in doing His will. This is absolutely true: the life of self never satisfies; one has to live in God as seen in other lives.'

Every seat in the Albert Hall was filled on the afternoon of Tuesday, October 10, to hear the presidential address. It took about an hour to deliver, and the Bishop's clear voice reached to every part of the building. His subject was the work of the Church in the modern State. He showed how much of the work formerly left to the Church was now done by the State ; still, ' the Church has created Christian civilisation and must be the chief agent in spreading that civilisation in other lands. . . . on the Church falls directly the maintenance of the basis of national life. . . . The quiet work of creating character is the continuous contribution which the Church makes to the life of the nation.'

He concluded with these words :

' For myself—shall I venture to confess it?—I have an ideal of the Church of England which has steadily grown with my growth. I see in it a Church not existing in indefinite space, and founding claims to universality on the ground that it has no particular home, but a Church rooted in the minds and hearts of the English people. I am not ashamed to say that, as I look round the world, I see no other home so well suited for a divine institution. From that home it can go forth courageously and face the world as it is, believing that God's revelation of Himself once made in the person of Christ Jesus, is being continually explained to man by that progressive revelation of God's purpose, which is continually being made by the divine government of the world. Steadfast in its hold on the faith and on the Sacraments by its unbroken link with the past, it exists for the maintenance of God's truth and its application to the needs of man, not for the purpose of upholding its own power. A Church fitted for free men, training them in knowledge and in reverence alike ; disentangling the spirit from the form, because of its close contact with sons who love their mother and frankly speak out their minds ; not wandering among formulæ, however beautiful, which have lost their meaning ; finding room increasingly for every form of devotional life, but training its graces into close connexion with men's endeavours and aspirations ; having no objects of its own which it cannot explain and make manifest as being for the highest good of all ; afraid of nothing, receptive of new impulses ; quick, watchful, alert ; proving all things and ever ready to give a reason for its principles and for their application ; exhorting persuading, convincing ; so rooted in the past, that it is strong

in the present, and evermore hopeful of the future. For the great work of the Church of Christ is to mould the future, and so hasten the coming of the kingdom. Its eyes are turned to the past for instruction and warning, not for imitation. Steadfast in the faith built upon the foundation which its Master laid, it can speak the truth in love, using such words and methods as men can best understand; so penetrated by the importance of its message that it can speak it in manifold ways, to men of varying tempers and knowledge and feelings, but striving to speak it in such a way that the method of its teaching ever elevates and invigorates the taught.

‘Is this only a dream, to be realised—for realised assuredly it must be—at some future time, and under some other name? Or shall we enter upon the possession which is really ours did we but know it? Our difficulties and differences arise because we have not a sufficiently lofty conception of the destiny of the English Church. If any disaster befalls it, the record that will be written hereafter will be that English Churchmen of this our day were not sufficiently large-hearted and high-minded to recognise the greatness of the heritage which was theirs.’

The Bishop presided at every meeting in the Albert Hall, and in most cases himself concluded the debate. After the discussion on the Church and the laity he said:

‘I am quite sure that if the laity of the Church of England really wish to have the power, they can have it at very short notice by asking for it. They certainly would not be opposed by the clergy in making that request. It must have struck you as rather odd to-night that the laity should be listening to impassioned harangues by two of the clergy asking them to take upon themselves their own bounden duty.’

Speaking about missions he said:

‘Every time I am privileged to hear the subject of missions discussed I am struck by the obvious signs which go to prove that missionary interest is making its way to the hearts of the people . . . speakers appeal to the feelings of those who have now placed missionary work in its true position as regards the whole proportion of things, and who have learnt to compare the missionary work of the present with the missionary work of the early centuries of the Church.’

In speaking of the divisions of English Christianity he said:

‘Unity is not by any means necessarily a unity of structure. . . . But by unity we *do* always mean a unity

of structure. That inevitably raises the question "What structure?" Then every intellectual conception a man possesses arises at once. We begin our efforts in the sphere of moral and religious exaltation, but the moment we raise the question "What structure?" we drop down out of that into a region where moral enthusiasm does not penetrate, and where it can do nothing—into a region where simple logic and intellect prevail. There is the difficulty. In the moral sphere we can rise to far greater heights than we can in the intellectual sphere. . . . Again we are and can be as individuals on very good terms, and we can agree generally on nearly every point which influences practice. But the moment the separate interests of separate organisations rise up, people act to one another very differently. Let me speak quite frankly. We of the Church of England, I think, do wish to be on as friendly terms as we possibly can with all nonconformist ministers. Certainly, speaking for myself, I do most heartily. But there is this practical difficulty which I always feel. It may be that I am thin-skinned, but I do not like, after I have been talking intimately and frankly with a man one day as a brother in Christ, to find that a week after, upon a public platform, he has found it necessary to talk about "purse-proud prelates," and to denounce the Bishop of London. Now, I am not finding fault with him remember, I quite see what he means by it. I only make this remark because I am trying my best to illustrate the actual difficulty which we have to face. It lies in the difference between the actual world in which a man lives, the things he has got to do day by day, and his higher aspirations. A certain unreality comes from trying to mix up the two, and we do not get any further by being unreal. I think that this attitude of which I have been speaking arises very greatly from our modes of political action. . . . We are accustomed to such a mode of procedure in politics, we are not accustomed to it in religion, and I do not want to get accustomed to it. If a good understanding is to go on, it must be by constantly keeping before us in all our intercourse and in all that we have to do with one another . . . not the system of the world at all, but the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ.'

The meeting of the congress which attracted most interest was that on 'the Church and her Services.' In the excited state of men's feelings—it was just at this time that the Bishop was trying to procure submission to the Archbishop's decision—it was fully expected that there would

be a disturbance. The hall was filled with an eager and excited crowd; there seemed to be all the elements of a row. At the opening of the meeting the Bishop said :

‘ I am told that the subject of discussion this afternoon is one on which there exists difference of opinion. It is upon such subjects that discussion is especially useful. Hence points of view differing from your own will probably be put before you freely and frankly. Now I would ask you to listen attentively to what is said, and not to attempt to turn a discussion into a demonstration. The truest way of showing that you hold your opinion strongly is to be able to listen quietly to all that can be said against it. You will never succeed in establishing your own opinion by trying to silence those who differ from you. Listen to their arguments; weigh them carefully; and then refute them temperately. We have just sung :

The world without may rage, but we
Will only cling more close to Thee.

‘ Let us not give the world an opportunity of saying that we only too faithfully reproduce its methods and walk in its ways. You will appreciate the importance of the example which we will give to-day. You may say that my remarks are needless; but you will forgive me for a strong desire not to have any need to interpose these remarks in the course of the debate.’

A sigh, partly of relief, partly of disappointment, seemed to go through the vast gathering. ‘ Splendid ! ’ said one man to his neighbour, ‘ but it spoils all the fun.’ On the whole, the President’s wishes were observed; once or twice the interruptions grew noisy, but were immediately checked by a sign from him. At the only serious attempt at interruption he rose and said, ‘ I must remind you that you have broken my rule more than once, and I must ask you not to do it again.’ At the end he said, ‘ We have reached the time appointed for the conclusion of this meeting, and I would only say that you have behaved so well that I cannot help wishing that you had behaved just a little better. I am quite sure that you have all of you profited by the discussion which you have heard to-day, and I will not attempt to sum it up further than by saying that we have heard many opinions, and that some, in my view, were a little wiser than others.’

The way in which the meeting went off was said to be a 'striking testimony of the Bishop's wise and firm conduct ; but for him it might very easily have got out of hand, and had a disastrous issue.'

To the working-men the Bishop spoke of the impression of force given by such a gathering, and said that the great force in the world was no longer physical force, or even intellectual force, but was the force of opinion ; hence the necessity that opinions should rest upon principles.

'If we can make our opinions higher and better, I think they will grow wiser of their own accord. . . . It is not always easy to know what is wisest, there is a continual conflict of opinion about that ; but there is not so much conflict of opinion about what is best. . . . Do not go about constantly making yourselves out to be superior persons, and thinking that your opinions are of enormous importance, simply because they are your own . . . Nothing is so contagious as opinion, and how easy it is in any given sphere for opinions to settle down upon a low level, instead of rising to a high level. I do not ask you to go about always preaching. It is not your business. I do not think that superior persons are, as a rule, very popular, and my advice to you is that, in pursuing good objects, you should never do it like a superior person. Do it as a sympathetic man who knows human weakness, talking as a brother to a brother and not trying to make yourself out either much wiser or much better than anyone else. Recognise how far your opinions carry. Remember that they are the secret of your force. Remember that it is your opinions that make for progress.'

To the children who filled the hall on Saturday afternoon, the Bishop spoke of the delight in cruelty shown by the child of a heathen chief, and then told them the following essay written by an English child on 'the cat.' "'The cat is a square quadruped, and as is customary with square quadrupeds, has its legs at the four corners. If you want to please this animal you must stroke it on the back. If it is very much pleased, it sets up its tail quite stiff like a ruler, so that your hand cannot get any further"—this,' the Bishop said, 'is a very truthful observation ; the child tried to put down what he had noticed about the cat ; but his next sentence was what particularly impressed

me: "the cat is said to have nine lives, but in this country it seldom needs them all because of Christianity;" this last sentence has a good deal packed away in it . . . the child knew that general kindness and love was the first principle of Christianity . . . it is this that you too ought to have, a sense of what it is that Christianity really does.'

The last meeting was for church choirs on Saturday evening. The Bishop spoke to them on a point about which he always felt strongly, the duty not to neglect English church music. 'I hope you will not think me exceedingly insular,' he went on, 'if I say that I regret to see a tendency to drop back on all occasions to foreign music. I should like to point my moral exactly. In connexion with this Church Congress there have been two services in St. Paul's Cathedral. The anthem on one occasion was by Brahms, on the other by Spohr. They were very beautiful anthems, most appropriate; only I think we English people when assembled together on such an occasion should have a little English music.'

He preached at the Thanksgiving Service in St. Paul's Cathedral at the close of the congress, and took as his subject 'the Spiritual Understanding.'¹ He described it as the capacity most needed by the Christian, the necessary qualification of the Christian teacher. The congress, with its varied opinions expressed in varied ways, should tend to quicken sympathy and spiritual understanding and mutual forbearance. He summed it all up by affirming, as so often, the supreme value of liberty: 'Liberty is the most precious gift that man can have—we know that it is so and we praise it; but do we sufficiently consider what any sense of liberty must really rest upon? It rests upon the recognition of God's divers ways in dealing with His children.'

It was said at the time 'that the congress as a whole was nothing but the expression of the mind of the President, his personality was stamped on every meeting . . . his tact and force ruled throughout.' Another remarked, 'The congress was a success, the President a revelation.'

The week after the congress we went to stay with the Humphry Wards in the country.

¹ Published in *The Mind of St. Peter and other Sermons*.

To his daughter Beatrice (then in America)

‘Stocks : October 18, 1899.

‘Dearest B.—We are here taking rest for a short space after the labours of the congress. The sun shines by day and the moon by night : it is quite warm : the woods look lovely and it is a joy to walk on the common. There is nobody here . . . only Mary and Janet are at home, and Mr. Ward sometimes. It is very peaceful and nice. The congress was a success beyond my hopes. I got through my work without being too much tired ; and on the whole I think that people approved of me. Here the war has decided itself : the Boers left no hope : everybody accepts the situation. . . . I got a letter from — saying that her husband will have to go soon. It is rather hard to part after ten weeks of matrimony with a chance of never meeting again. She is very good and brave about it, and tries to be quite cheerful. But it is small things like that which bring most vividly before one’s mind the meaning of war. . . . I cut the opening of Parliament yesterday, which was naughty, and roamed in the woods instead. It is nice to be at peace once more ; but a holiday hardly seems earned just yet. However, people have been very good in not writing me many letters : and that is why I find myself with time to write to you, which, however, I hope to do from time to time. Of course it is horrid being without you : but I hope you are having a good time, and I wish to put on record my hope that you will stay as long as you like. Don’t grow weary too soon. Of course one goes through phases : at first everything is new and exciting : then you feel as if you had got to the bottom of it, and it is dull. You must wait a bit to see nice points of difference apart from general impressions : then interest revives in them.’

To Lady Grey

‘Fulham Palace : October 23, 1899.

‘I was delighted to get your letter. You cannot think how it rejoices me to find something *human* among my correspondence, which rolls along in the shape of official communications, varied only by quarrelsome recriminations. Even these latter are amusing sometimes : and it is a source of satisfaction if one gets sense into somebody’s head. What a queer people we English are ! How we scream and clamour for somebody’s head on a charger, and would be horrified if anyone were to bring it to us. We talk any amount of nonsense before action is necessary ; when the time for action comes we are quite reasonable. I am glad that you liked my views about the Church. I always think that I could put

people on right lines if only they would abandon prejudice and face facts. But then human nature is made up of inherited prejudices, and men would fall to pieces without them. Very few can be expected to think things out. One has to make the best of them, and has to remember to make something better of oneself. . . .

'I heard a good account of you from Miss Freeman, whom I met at Stocks, where I went to sleep for three days after the congress. I sat in a chair for a week, and made sixteen speeches. It was horrible. Some people are always anxious to edify mankind: I never have any particular [belief] in my own opinions because they are my own: but I can never give any opinions except my own, and they have to be dragged out of me by force. I never like the process, and am never anxious to know what becomes of them afterwards, except a long time afterwards. Then it is sometimes astonishing to find them alive in somebody. Dear me, what an egotistical letter I am writing: but then you understand. . . .

'Your quotation from Carlyle is excellent. Years ago I came across a passage in a letter of FitzJames Stephen to FitzGerald, "The truth must be told about Carlyle. He is a man of one idea, but what that idea is no one is able to discover." That always remained in my mind as an adequate criticism. I remember someone once saying to me: "If you take away the Scotch accent and the insolence from Carlyle, there is very little left." That also is true.'

Early in October the Boer war began. At one of the congress meetings, the Bishop said, 'I have received to-day many letters asking me to commend to the prayers of the many clergymen who meet at this congress our brothers in South Africa, and those who are on their way thither.'

To a young friend whose husband was ordered to South Africa

'Stocks: October 11, 1899'

'I was very anxious to know if — was to be ordered to Africa. I thought it impossible that he could escape. Everybody I know is going. Of course they like it in a way: but there is always another way in all things. Of course also your letter was just like you, as good as anyone could be: only it is hard to have one's husband taken away after barely three months: there is no getting over that. But you faced all these things before, and I won't even pity either of you, because it is no good. We all have to do our duty. It is a mixture of joy and pain to face it: only when it is over

does the joy remain. . . . Of course you and — are happier every day : good people always are. It is amazing how happiness entirely depends on goodness. . . . I should like to send all sorts of messages to —. He will understand them, for they are hard to speak out. Don't you think that all real messages are understood? They depend on a look or a handshake, not on what is said. If one tries to say it, one spoils it. But you will know that I am thinking much of both of you. God bless and keep you both.'

'The Athenæum : November 6, 1899.

'I must scribble a line to tell you how much I feel for you. I am always thinking of your trial, which is a very real one, and comes home to many. But you know how hard it is for anyone outside to say the right thing. Those who are about you do not know how to say what they feel ; they only feel their own incompetence. It is hard to know that one has to look on and cannot help.

'There is nothing for it but such courage as you can summon, and to go about other things as much as you can. There are hardships on every side ; alas ! we have to learn what war means.'

To his niece Winifred

'November 3, 1899.

'The war is horrible in some ways. But we will never get rid of war, and we have to learn its lessons. A nation's life, after all, depends on its belief in itself : and we have to settle whether South Africa is to be brought under our ideas or under those of the Boers. I do not know whether or no it was necessary to raise the question now. Mr. Chamberlain thought so decidedly. But if the question is raised, it must be settled. We are having some of our conceit and self-confidence abated—that is good for us. We have much to learn after a long period of having our own way.'

On November 8, he lectured for the London Reform Union to a large audience in the Queen's Hall. He writes on October 26 : 'I have also a lecture to write on "London in the Days of Elizabeth,"¹ which I began on Monday, and must finish soon. It rather amuses me to have a definite thing to read about. It is only this that drives me back again to consult old books.'

On the last Sunday in November he was engaged to preach before the Queen, and was disappointed at having to refuse

¹ Printed in *Historical Lectures and Addresses*.

an invitation to Sandringham for the same Sunday to meet the Emperor of Germany. But the Queen heard of the invitation, and fixed another Sunday for his visit to Windsor.

To his niece Winifred

‘ Fulham Palace : November 17, 1899.

‘ I am going to Sandringham to meet the German Emperor. Emperors are a class with whom it is difficult to have a large acquaintance, but mine is extending, you see.’

To his niece Ella

‘ Sandringham : November 29, 1899.

‘ I am here, and have been making the acquaintance of the German Emperor. It seems ridiculous that I should do such things ; who would have thought it ten years ago ? Yet I have been having a long talk with him about Germany and England, and the politics of Europe. Such is life. He is a very nice and attractive man. The Empress also is quiet and intelligent. We have all been taking a long walk, Emperor and Empress, Prince and Princess of Wales, and all their children, and even a grandchild, Prince Edward of York. The old Duke of Cambridge was there, with a vast multitude of others.’

In the course of his sermon ¹ at Sandringham he said :

‘ A nation, like an individual, has much to learn, and must learn it, as the individual learns, mainly by sympathetic intercourse with like-minded nations. On this gradual education of nations, more than anything else, the hope of the world's future depends. Nations with like ideas of righteousness go forth on their separate ways, not that they may emphasise the differences which arise from differing experience, but that they may bring the results of their experience to a common stock. The Teutonic race has the same fundamental ideas. It has the same sense of duty, the same conception of conscience, the same aspiration after justice as the highest expression of national righteousness. We cannot shut our eyes to the responsibility which God's Providence has placed upon the nations of the Teutonic race. . . . It is not enough that each nation should recognise and glorify these ideas as it knows them. It must learn from the experience of other nations to understand them better and apply them more thoroughly. Is not this the task which lies before the great nations of the Teutonic stock ? Shall we not combine in a spirit of comradeship to help one another to perform a work which we have in common ? ’

¹ Published in *The Mind of St. Peter and other Sermons*.

To his niece Winifred

‘ Fulham : December 1, 1899.

‘ I have been in the usual struggle after my time at Sandringham, which I enjoyed. The Emperor asked to have my sermon printed, so I have been busy in writing it out. . . . I see you want to know how one behaves to an emperor—just as I do to the Queen : I bow and take his hand if he gives it. On Sunday night at Sandringham, after dinner, I was standing talking to Lord Acton, when the Emperor came up and began a conversation. Presently he said, “ Shall we sit down ? ” So we sat by ourselves and continued our talk till the Prince came and said : “ The Princess wishes to say good-night before she goes to bed.” What do you think we talked about ? Ghosts and second-sight and apparitions : the evidence for it and its meaning.’

‘ December 16.

‘ I went to Windsor on Saturday, and preached to the Queen on Sunday, and then took a walk. After lunch I sat and read and felt a crick in my leg, which I thought would go away. So I went to St. George’s Chapel for service, and could scarcely hobble back. I hobbled to dinner, where the Duke of Cambridge spotted me hobbling, and called the Queen’s attention, who was very perturbed, and sent to me to sit down after dinner. Then she sent her doctor before I went to bed, and next morning, at half-past 8, sent to inquire how I was, and to say that I was not to go away if I was suffering. However, I had to go at 9.30, and the Queen telegraphed the next day to ask how I was. You see what an old dear she is. . . . The war news is terrible. Never have we been so low. No one can foresee the future. We have been for a long time much too arrogant and insolent, and we must repent and learn humility. It is too dreadful. This will be a quiet Christmas for everybody. No one knows what personal disasters may be befalling relatives and friends from day to day. We must think and pray and humble ourselves. Life is becoming a very serious matter to us all, and we must learn to face its seriousness. But the joys of quiet affection still remain, and nothing can affect love which abides when all else goes.’

After getting home from Windsor he was obliged to stay in bed for several days, and on one day had a sudden and most alarming attack of violent internal pain, the cause of which was never really discovered. He spent in bed the terrible week when the news of one crushing disaster after another reached England from South Africa.

He was just able to hold his Christmas Ordination, and on December 29 preached at a service of intercession for the war held in St. Paul's Cathedral. He said that we must use rightly the sharp reminder which God had given us to save us from the spirit of self-satisfied presumption; we could only venture to stand before God if we could plead that in a blind and fitful way we had still been true to the high purpose with which He had entrusted us. War was only a revealer of principles always at work, and showed the powers which were there already; in praying for the soldiers we prayed also for ourselves, that we might bear with patience whatever God sent us. War filled us with a sense of our individual powerlessness, but it was the wisdom of the people as a whole that was shown in its statesmen and generals, and none must forget their responsibility for their opinions.¹

When asked by one of the daily papers for a motto for the New Year, he sent these lines:

Oh, earlier shall the rosebuds blow
 In after years, those happier years,
 And children weep when we lie low
 Far fewer tears, far softer tears.
 Oh, true shall boyish laughter ring
 Like tinkling chimes in kinder times,
 And merrier shall the maidens sing,
 And I not there, and I not there.²

To his niece Ella

‘ Fulham Palace: January 11, 1900.

‘ I need cheering up, as I do not feel very vigorous yet, and my holidays are coming to an end, as I have to work hard again. I have felt that pottering about and taking holiday was necessary; and have shown Winnie all the museums in London. . . . Lately the weather has been quite nice. We had a lovely day at Hampton Court on Tuesday. It looked quite charming; perhaps winter lights agree with old red brick buildings.’

LETTERS 1899

To Miss Mary Bateson

‘ Fulham Palace: February 3, 1899.

‘ My dear Mary,—Only yesterday my chaplain unearthed your catalogue of Sion Coll. library from a mass of docu-

¹ Published in *The Mind of St. Peter and other Sermons*.

² *Ionica*, p. 59.

ments in his room, by which it had been covered. Sometimes it happens that parcels are overlooked when we are very busy, and then confusion arises.

‘Thank you very much for it. It represents an enormous amount of labour, and is done with a thoroughness that ought to satisfy even Lord Acton. It is a great thing to keep up a high standard of editing. It is not a point on which we in England excel ; but I hope that the art is spreading.

‘Of course your work will meet with little recognition at first ; but it will be very useful to students, and in future generations men will praise your name. This is all we can hope for. Happy is the being who can look forward quietly to the future, instead of being exposed to the jibes of the present. Compare yourself with me and rejoice.

‘I hope that Leicester¹ is progressing. Nothing progresses that I do.’

To his son Walter (in Frankfort)

‘February 14, 1899.

‘Dearest Walter,—I have just grasped the terrible fact that you will be twenty-one on Friday. I call it “terrible” because the thought of all the family growing up makes me meditate on the past and on the future. The past is very nice to think of : and I suppose it is no good attempting to forecast the future. So I will withdraw the epithet, and accept the fact. I do not know that there is anything very sad in the thought that you come of age without entering into a large possession. It is better, after all, to make one’s own way in the world, and consider what one wants to do and be. People are not very happy in my experience who find life made ready for them. They do not get much out of it. All that is worth having comes from one’s own effort. These are painfully moral remarks : you will think them very dull. But I mean that I wish you very much happiness in the future, with plenty of energy, a clear purpose in life, a cheerful and contented spirit, a love of things high and holy, which never fails to give satisfaction and peace of mind.

‘I have been very busy lately, but I do not wish to grumble. I have had tolerably peaceful evenings, except for dinner parties, of which we have been having a series. . . . On Thursday I had to make a speech in the House of Lords. It is a dreadful thing to do, as no one cheers or looks at you, or seems to listen. You have to stagger on blindly, and do not know if you are making an ass of yourself or not. How-

¹ *The Municipal Records of Leicester*, which Miss Bateson was engaged in editing.

ever it does not matter. I think, however, that our speeches did good, and stopped the nonsense talked about church matters. . . . Probably you find that your life gives you time to think. The general life of a family hides the necessity of individual thought. There is always someone to talk to, or a book to pick up, or something trifling to do. Sometimes you may find it dull to be thrown on yourself so much : but it is a useful thing. We have all of us to find ourselves ; some people take a long time in making the discovery.'

To C. D.

'Windsor Castle : February 19, 1899.

'We English are very curious people ; we are so shy and reserved ; it is hard for us to talk to one another about what is deepest in our being. Of course I wanted to talk to you about all sorts of things, but did not like to begin. I suppose that is due to my own feebleness.

'How various is human character : how little do we know of all that happens in another's soul, even of the outlines of the process that is going on and is the greatest reality of their life ! How dull and stupid and short-sighted we are !

'Dear, the certainty of faith comes from believing. It is like any great hypothesis of science, it proves itself by accounting for what we see. Or rather, science accounts for what we see : religion for what we feel.

'I understand that it is a trial to you to have agnostic friends whom you love and respect, who are higher-minded and better than most Christians whom you know. It is also the case with me. I have many friends of that kind, with whom I feel more at ease, with whom on many points I feel in more real agreement, than with the vast multitude of those who symbolise with me. But I do not presume to judge them : nor do I understand them. I can only look into myself, and try to understand what I see there. I know my own needs, I must do my best for them. I must be true to the best I know. I cannot know how or what others know. But this much I see—that opinions can be precise and clear as the field which they cover is small. If we try to grasp the world as it is, language fails us in our attempts to *explain*—we must *feel*, we must *sympathise*, we must break out into parable. Life can only be explained by a Life : and I see in Jesus that life of which all other life is but a partial reflex. I always find that scepticism narrows the real problem, refuses to face the actual facts, substitutes energy in reforming the world for power to deal with it as it is. I can sympathise with all that it has to say and all that it

tries to do: but there is so much beyond. The world is a pathless wilderness: it purposes to turn it into a watered garden. This is an attractive prospect—but now [how]?

‘All purely intellectual positions break down. They go so far and no further. They are beset by limitations. How striking is the epistle for to-day,¹ in which St. Paul, burning with anxiety to explain his own real self, what he was and what he did, can only do so by a series of contradictory propositions. It is so true to life. We are clear by missing out half the elements involved. It is not vague emotion when we grapple with immensity: and there is immensity in every human soul. Its progress is marvellous, inexplicable. The simplest soul is full of amazing problems. Try to explain yourself as you can, there is a vast residuum which you cannot turn into shape. How is all this to be dealt with? I answer, only by conscious communion with a Person who *is* Life and Truth.

‘Forgive this. Write to me again. I have been preaching to the Queen, who is marvellously well and cheery, and as clever as can be. I had a long talk with her last night to my real comfort.’²

About the dedication of a book which he had accepted without being sufficiently acquainted with the author’s views on church questions, which were pointed out to him by one of his clergy.

‘February 27, 1899.

‘When I have made a mistake I try to learn its lesson for future purposes of guidance. But one lesson is that it is very difficult to undo the original mistake. I accepted the dedication of a book in ignorance of its contents. That was a great error, and I will not be guilty of it again.

‘But if I try to mend it, I shall only succeed in calling attention to a worthless book, and giving it notoriety, which at present it does not possess. If I send “I withdraw the dedication,” I should be referred to the publisher, who would only be too glad of such an advertisement. I should call attention to the objectionable passages which are now known only to a few. An explanation only makes things worse. Silence is the wisest course. The book will find its way rapidly to oblivion if it be left alone.’

To G. H.

‘May 13, 1899.

‘I am very much interested by your lessons of illness. They are really very valuable, and teach one very much about

¹ Epistle for the first Sunday in Lent, 2 Cor. vi. 1.

² He is reported to have said of the Queen that she was the best Liberal he knew.

oneself. Above all they teach one that one's *self* is purely one's own, and that no one can help one. All the help is a sense of love and sympathy that someone cares for one, for one's own sake. That shows how important one's *self* is. I think we are always clamouring for love, without considering if we are really worth it. It has to be won like all other things. These are things worth learning: and they help one to see how one stands in the eyes of God, who gives us credit for what man cannot see.'

' Fulham Palace: June 21, 1899.

' Yes, we all claim too much in life. We think that we have a right to anything we claim: but we have to win it. It is quite true that love cannot be explained, that is its charm. But you will see that people who are loved are open, simple, straightforward, sympathetic, who invite your confidence. I think it is not quite true that some people cannot earn love simply by being nice. All nice-minded people are attractive. The people who are not attractive are those who are selfish, self-asserting, insolent, conceited, wanting their own way and so on. Such people make their own choice; they prefer to force their way through the world. You do not see any reason for helping them, and stand aside. You will see that people get help just as they invite help. The proud, stubborn, independent choose to stand alone, and then ask to be loved also. But one loves the quiet, simple, appealing nature. In fact, everybody responds to a reasonable demand, and if we want anything we must make a reasonable demand for it. Instead of this, everybody claims it as a right, and grumbles when they do not get it. But the cause of love in any particular case cannot be stated; it arises because two people understand one another and have found it out and enjoy it.'

' Courmayeur: September 2, 1899.

' I am sorry that you are gloomy. Of course the world is always going wrong: that is to say, it goes its way and not your way. But you cannot help that, and must make the best of it. If you look long enough at things there is a great deal more good than evil, and evil is always tending to be wiped out if it does not improve. Good and evil are curiously mixed, and on the whole it is better to think people better than they are than worse than they are; one can only hope that experience will teach them. . . . Anyhow it is of no use for you to feel that the weight of the world rests on your shoulders. Stand yourself: look at the things in which you can help. Cheer up and make the best of things, and hope for a good end. That is my advice.'

To the Rev. Canon Cruttwell 'Fulham Palace : October 3, 1899.

'My dear Cruttwell,—Thank you very much for your book.¹ I have looked through it, and think it excellent in every way. Its temper is admirable, and above all it goes to real points at issue. We shall never get on till we recognise what they really are. I have been laying down lately that we have really reached a point at which we have to take stock of all that has been happening during the last fifty years : and we must set to work patiently to determine how much of it can be received into the system of the Church of England.'

To the Rev. A. W. Hutton 'Fulham Palace, S.W. : October 4, 1899.

'My dear Mr. Hutton,—I am very much obliged to you for sending me your edition of Maitland's "Essays"—I quite agree with you that it is now time for us to try and get nearer the actual facts of the Reformation. It seems that prejudices have to be removed one by one, and that what is done to remove one prejudice tends to create another. The "continuity" theory has been overdone. In the sense of continuity of organisation it is true ; but this has been made to carry a vast amount, which must be disentangled. The changes made in England were changes in spirit, temper, appeal to learning, and assertion of liberty. This must be more adequately recognised.'

To one in great trouble 'Fulham Palace, S.W. : October 9, 1899.

'I am very sorry for the sad story which you tell me of the many sorrows which have beset you and yours. I fully sympathise with your feelings and with the difficulties which you experience. They are natural, and it is very hard for another who does not feel them himself to speak anything which does not seem cold and remote. It is not a question for reason, but for feeling. It is a question as old as humanity. It is the question of the book of Job. I advise you to read that carefully in Dean Bradley's "Lectures on Job." Also do you know James Hinton's "The Mystery of Pain"? That is the best book on the whole subject.

'But let me say a few things. Our view of life depends on our claims : and we tend to take our claims on a reasonable average. But the fact of the existence of an *average* means that some fall below.

'After all, life is an individual thing. It is quite true that our lives are largely dependent on other lives. But what are

¹ *Six Lectures on the Oxford Movement.*

we in our very self? Sorrow, loss, bereavement, only raise that question. Can we answer "I am nothing but my relations to this or that person"? We would feel that this is unworthy. It omits our permanent relation to God, which is really that from which all other relations derive their force. *I* have a place in the world, a life to live, a work to do, independent of all outward things and of all other persons. It is a hard strain for me to have to realise this sometimes. But it is the fact. Perhaps no modern writer has expressed this so forcibly as Browning. Read him.

'I would tell you of a friend of mine, who had an unhappy childhood, overshadowed by the misconduct of his two brothers, who brought their father to his grave. On the father's death one of these disreputable brothers succeeded to the property; then the other. They had to be watched that they did not fabricate an heir. At last my friend succeeded, and purposed to enter public life, for which he had been carefully preparing himself. Just then his wife died . . . and grief made him so far deaf as to overthrow all his projects. He had to face life alone, afresh at the age of forty. Talking to me about it all, he said, with emphasis at the end, "Yet I would not have it different after all. It has thrown me back upon my very self."

'I tell you this because an example is better than precept. Your life has been dislocated; you feel the pain and numbness. Take courage: make it afresh. That is your task. It is useless to murmur that there are many who have not that work to do. Remember that the use of prayer is to bring our will into accord with God's will. Remember how God blessed the latter years of Job. Remember that there must be examples of heroism of various kinds. Your brother set an example in one kind. Shall not his example weigh with you in another and equally real sphere of heroism?'

From his letters to his nieces

'*February*.—It is very "north country" to feel so much concerned about giving trouble to other people. It is part of the northern pride. We were made to give people trouble; and it is a very good thing for them in moderation.'

'There is always so much to learn and so much to feel. And one has to learn how to feel rightly: that is the nuisance. One begins by thinking that one's feelings at least are all right, or do not matter, or that one is not responsible for them. But alas one *is* responsible for all that comes out of them, and has to accept that position.'

‘You want your intelligence developed to the level of your feelings. Feel, but understand what and why you feel, and what you make other people feel ; and what follows from the indulgence of one’s feelings by themselves.’

‘One may take any amount of kindness from other people ; but one must never let them pay money out of pocket for anything. I think this is rather an important rule to keep—in going about with people, for instance, only an elderly man or woman may pay one’s fares : a young man must not be permitted to do so. Obligations may be incurred generally, but not specially. You stay with a person as long as they and you like : the house is there and the food, and you are only one more, and that does not matter. But anything else is particular and attaches to oneself.’

March.—Yes, it is a difficult thing to learn as life goes on, how grim it is. One sees that sometimes in the case of others, and then forgets it, and thinks it will never come to oneself.’

‘About the difficulty of finding new thoughts in one’s surroundings, remember that there are always two sources from which everyone can draw, nature and books. There are also people ; and humble folk are just as amusing as any others. They often say shrewd things, and always have a large experience behind them. Remember Wordsworth’s “Leech-gatherer.” He puts in that poem his sense of depression, his joy in nature, and what he learned from a simple man. You are finding out, in the case of your sick man, how valuable is the result of life’s experience, and how one can find it in simple folk in a clear form, seeing its results, and its power to give contentment. Right principles work out right conclusions, whatever the circumstances of life may be ; wrong principles never lead to anything, however nice the surroundings may seem. We have the root of our happiness within us. It all consists in the power of seeing God and His workings in the souls of others. Then life is full of interest.’

‘Love is founded on a perception of the finer side of character, invisible and unexplainable to the ordinary person. I was at a concert last night listening to some words of Shelley set to music. They spoke of a woman :

Who when my being overflowed
Was like a chalice to bright wine,
Which else had sunk into the thirsty earth.

It is all there. One’s being overflows : there are thoughts which it is hard to express ; one does not know their value ; if there is no one to receive them, they sink into the earth and

leave no trace. But love is there with a golden chalice to catch them, and show their brightness another beauty, and make them a perpetual possession.'

'*April.*—Yes, it is a very extraordinary thing how hard it is to say one's prayers rightly. Everybody always feels it. It is a sign how bad we naturally are. Do you remember that the disciples came to Jesus and asked Him, "Lord, *teach* us to pray." It is a thing we cannot do by ourselves. I always think the Collect so wise which claims for us no more than to be "those to whom thou hast given an hearty desire to pray." It does not say that we can pray, but that God has given us a wish to pray. It is a thing which does not come naturally, but has to be practised and improved. I believe that everybody supposes that everybody else prays more easily than they do, but it is difficult for us all.'

'I do not think that it is a mistake to have feelings, but they have to be kept under control. I know people who have schooled themselves into an unnatural coldness for fear of being too impulsive. But, after all, our feelings are our opportunities; they give a signal. . . . Feelings are beckonings and discoveries, not simply passing expressions of delight. The desire to do things for others comes from a greater knowledge of others' lives and characters. Feelings ought to be constantly broadening our sympathies, and showing how much there is in other people's lives. It is possible to do one's duty in a cold outside way which does not touch others: we have to try and do it with sympathy, founded on the respect which comes from knowledge. But we must regard our feelings as giving us knowledge rather than mere enjoyment.'

'*May.*—You see that girls are very curious beings. They are always at your age oppressed by a sense of activities within them for which they find no scope. This is a natural restlessness; they are being impelled to find out how much they can do. It is a painful process, and it has to be faced. The worst of it is that there are few indications to help one. One has to find out the answer for oneself. . . . The object of life is to pull oneself together: to equate one's energies with one's opportunities, and to make opportunities to fit one's energies. It is a hard job anyhow. But then, if life could be made easy we should be lazy and dull.'

'*June.*—We have our fights to fight of different kinds. Life would be very dull if we had not. But remember that mistakes are serious: and it is worth many a fight not to make a mistake. It sometimes seems hard that everyone

should have to fight so constantly : but one learns a great deal in the process, and it is only by one's own efforts that one's life becomes richer and fuller. The object of all life's discipline is to have oneself in hand, and be able to act freely up to the best one knows. Misery comes from having committed oneself to less than the best.'

'*September*.—One really begins to be a human being when one can face the question "After all what am I and what are my immediate impressions worth?" I am but part of a great whole which I am bound to serve and by regarding which I really live. If I am to be *myself*, it must be because I keep in order my immediate impressions, my first desires, my imperfect thoughts. . . . Then there grows a true self, which is strong because it is founded on law and is part of an order of things which cannot fail because it is eternal. Something of this kind in some shape or another must be the foundation of every real life.'

'Ivrea : September 21, 1899.

'It is well to have a good grumble sometimes, because it clears things up. You see people are of different kinds. Let me try to describe some of them from one point of view—(1) There is the person who frankly throws herself on the world and says "Please take care of me. I will do what you want me to do and amuse you, if only you will amuse me." (2) There is the person who goes her own way and quietly takes what she wants for herself. (3) There is the person who is ready to put everybody else right, and goes along shouting out directions to others so fast that she is constantly stumbling herself. (4) There is the person who quietly does all she can for others without making any fuss about it. Now each of these classes of people have their reward. There is profound wisdom in our Lord's words when He said about people who were not satisfactory, "Verily, I say unto you they have their reward." The world is a good-natured place and pays everybody quite fairly for service rendered. But the mistake is that nobody is content with her due wages, but wants somebody else's wages. We act, say, in a way to inspire esteem, and we say, "Oh, but I want affection." We act so as to inspire affection, and we say, "What is that worth? I want respect." So it goes on. Further, we always suppose that all affection is of the same kind : but it is not : it is of very divers kinds and answers to divers kinds of characters. We all of us want another kind than we work for. Look at the matter on a large scale. It is curious how life is full of compensations. A favourite

singer or actor is applauded to the skies, is overwhelmed with bouquets, is an object of universal admiration, is spoiled and petted in every way. Why? Because the pleasure which she gives is immediate, is intense for the moment, passes away, and leaves little behind. It is paid for on the spot, because it is consumed on the spot. A great poet, a great statesman, is neglected for years, has to fight his way to the front, is then sharply criticised, is always liable to violent abuse. He goes on his way knowing that what he does and says will bear its fruit, not in the immediate pleasure which it gives, but in the good it does in the long run. He will be judged not now, but by posterity. It is curious to see how this law of compensation works out.

‘So you see life consists in knowing what we are doing and what reward we are working for (I mean here and now) and taking what is our due.’

‘*October*.—It is curious to see people who have done things. It is impossible to say why they did them of all people. It is not so much special gifts, or any exceptional zeal or earnestness. There may be many zealous people, but they do not succeed. All depends on a certain force, insight, and adaptability which cannot be taught.’

To F. S. Stevenson, Esq.

‘Fulham Palace: November 3, 1899.

‘My dear Sir.—I am very much obliged to you for your *Life of Grosseteste*. I sincerely rejoice that a scholarly life of so great a man should have been undertaken so successfully. I have long thought that Grosseteste deserved a good monograph, and I congratulate you on having filled up the want so admirably.

‘I do not notice that you have referred to a little pamphlet of Dr. Luard, “*England and the Holy See*.” Perhaps you did not come across it. It was a sort of *Vorgeschichte* to Grosseteste, dealing with the period of the Legatine Government. I only mention it because I think that Luard is a man whose excellent work is sometimes overlooked.

‘One side of Grosseteste interested me. England, as in many things, showed an example in this—that reform in the Church was impossible within the limits of the curial system. One feels that Grosseteste, strong as he was, was continually being pulled up short, and felt that his action became inconclusive. It is no wonder that his successors found a difficulty in going on, and composed themselves to make the best of what they could not mend. England had little belief in the conciliar movement. It had turned its attention to making the best terms for itself.’

To his daughter Beatrice (then in America)

‘ Fulham Palace : November 20, 1899.

‘ Dearest B.,—I have been following your adventures with great interest. You have been going over the places where I went, and have been seeing them in the same sort of way. I dare say that you have discovered that America is very like England, though the Americans persist in thinking that it is not. I suppose that individuals and nations alike have a craze for thinking themselves original—not seeing that originality is only possible in very small limits, and must certainly be left to other people to discover in us, not to be made known by ourselves.

‘ The general tenor of my life is as usual ; many things to do and not much apparent result. I was just saying to mother to-day that the Archbishop was 78—to-day was his birthday—and that I perfectly quailed at the thought of going on for twenty years more. She consoled me by the remark, which may be true, that the period which I had reached in my work in London was perhaps the most trying—when novelty had worn off, when I had said what I had to say, when people had first listened and then criticised ; and that I must wait a bit for the habit of going on. I must hope so, but all through life I have had the same difficulty and have never made up my mind what I ought to do. I can produce most effect by frankness, by being myself, by being willing to be misunderstood ; but while I do something for individuals in this way, I never know if repression of self and decorous dulness would not better fit an official position. If you are going to be yourself, you must pay for it : but ought a bishop to have anything to pay ? Of course he must have something ; but can I struggle on in the effort to educate people at large ? This frequently comes into my mind. Ought I to get rid of myself more and become dull and solemn ?

‘ This sounds like a moan. I did not sit down to moan, but to tell you of a visit to Sandringham to meet the Emperor and Empress of Germany. I went to preach, and the Prince of Wales asked me to say something about friendly relations between England, Germany, and America. This was rather awful, and I preached a sermon with some dismay. But the Emperor liked it very much. It was quite possible that he should have resented an appearance of lecturing him. But he said “ That was excellent : it is just what I am trying to teach my people.” . . . The Emperor’s vigour is tremendous : he is always all there : and it is impossible not to look with awe on the man whose first act was to dismiss Bismarck.

‘Altogether his visit seemed to please him, and all his suite and his Prime Minister Bülow, who accompanied him, went out of their way to say so. It was impossible not to feel that there was great political importance attaching to it. It was a very funny feeling for me that I was called to play a little part in determining the future of European politics. What I said, and how the Emperor took it, will go to all the persons who have to determine those great matters. You can imagine my thankfulness that I succeeded. I was aghast at the Prince’s message, which came to me two days before. But I have learned that the Prince of Wales is always right about practical matters, and knows what he is about. Lord Acton was there also, and I enjoyed a talk with him. I did gymnastics of a terrific kind with my future King, to the Emperor’s great amusement. By my future King I mean Prince Edward of York.’

‘Fulham Palace : December 14, 1899.

‘Dearest B.,—I feel that I must write you a few words of greeting for Christmas. . . . I am more and more amused by the account of your meeting exactly the same persons as we met, and finding them just the same as we did. But it is the same I believe in every country. There is a certain cosmopolitan set whose duty it is to represent their country to foreigners, and foreigners accept the representation for truth. . . . I think that this war and all that is befalling us is rather opening the eyes of the British public. I hope that it is teaching them a little humility. I am afraid that I have so long been convinced that we need the lesson that I cannot decline to pay the necessary price. We are being taught better behaviour in a very decided manner. Well, we must learn gladly and willingly. I am bound to admit that we are behaving very well under it, but we are feeling it deeply ; and I think that we are conscious that everybody is glad to see some of the conceit taken out of us. Well, well : we must learn our lessons and take our reverses.’

To C. D.

‘Fulham Palace : December 22, 1899.

‘. . . As life goes on we all of us learn to trust less in ourselves. That is a great lesson to learn, as the fault of the present day, perhaps of all days, is excessive individualism and self-confidence. It seems to me that the war is giving us food for reflection on that point. But I was very much struck a little time ago by the report which an agnostic lady gave me of her experience of a visit to the Australian colonies. She said : “One thing I have learned—

the necessity of voluntary schools and religious teaching. I may not agree with its results, but then I must have some basis for my difference. It does not do for people to have no basis for their life except the desire for material well-being. This only produces arrogance, and what I can only describe as *blatancy*."

'Man cannot really live without some sense of awe, some relationship of his own life to a bigger set of conditions. We learn this as we grow older, and happiness is only to be found in "committing our way unto the Lord." What are *my* ways? I find other people with different ways. Why should my ways be better than theirs? There is no test except the end to which they lead. And the end becomes more and more important till it absorbs the ways.

'Is not this the answer to our dread of responsibility? Who is sufficient for these things? we often ask. Our life supplies innumerable problems which we cannot answer—and when we have an answer, no one will listen to it. There is only one answer, "Go on : do your best." The life of our affections is given us to show how much we can do for some : it always seems to me that we ought by increasing sympathy to extend that power to more. Our affections are founded simply on a power of vision in a limited sphere. To *see* more, that is what we need.

'I am sending you a sermon of mine, not that it is of any merit, but it pleased the German Emperor, who asked for it to be printed. He with his responsibility felt something of the process which I tried to describe. It is a process applicable to all things.'

CHAPTER XIII

THE LAST YEAR

THE new year opened gloomily. The whole nation was weighed down by the deep anxiety of the war. A peaceful settlement of the differences within the Church seemed as remote as ever. The Bishop wrote in the autumn of 1899 :

‘I think that the recalcitrant clergy are falling in, but this is merely a trifle, and does not touch the real position. There is no hope of people agreeing : they must learn to agree to differ and live in peace. But the public mind is now taken up with the war. Luckily it cannot keep two things at once. This is a mercy. It will pitch into the Boers instead of the bishops. All the same I would much rather bear the brunt of all things than have this horrid war going on.’

His tone of mind at the beginning of 1900 is shown in his message to his diocese :

‘I am asked to write a few words by way of a New Year’s message to the diocese. I do so with great reluctance, for my words must be words of warning, not of encouragement.

‘We cannot shut our ears to the voice of God, which is speaking to us as a nation. It rebukes our pride and our self-conceit ; it warns us that we must strive, more than we have been striving of late, to show ourselves worthy of our place in the world.

‘We must set ourselves to learn that lesson ; to practise greater humility ; to have less confidence in our own inherent wisdom ; to have more sympathy for other peoples, and more charity towards all men.

‘I wish that I could say that the Church had been doing its best to teach this needful lesson to the English people. Unfortunately it has only been reproducing in its own quarrels the temper that prevails. Just in the point where an example was most needed, it has not been given. The Church has

adopted the methods of politics. It has presented the appearance of parties contending against one another. It has injured its spiritual influence by descending to trivial disputes. It has not shown the English people a higher spirit or a better way.

‘I should not be true to my office if I did not say this. We of the clergy have need to humble ourselves before God, recognising our special responsibility for the popular temper. The Church is the one organisation that can deal faithfully with this temper. Instead of trying to educate it, the Church has adopted it, and has set before the public eye the familiar spectacle of bodies of Englishmen desperately determined to have their own way by every means in their power.

‘I would beseech you to think of this in the presence of God; and to remember that if the Church fails to set forth to the world a higher spirit than the world can produce, it fails altogether.

‘I leave with you a simple motto, suggested by the season :

τὸ ἐπιεικὲς ὑμῶν γνωσθήτω πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις.

‘Let your forbearance be known unto all men.’—Phil. iv. 5.

‘To guide you in your meditations I cannot do better than quote the words of Aristotle (Rhet. I, xiii.).

“It is *ἐπιείκεια* to pardon human failings; to look to the lawgiver, not to the law; to the spirit, not to the letter; to the intention, not to the action; to the whole, not to the part; to the character of the actor in the long run, and not in the present moment; to remember good rather than evil, and good that one has received rather than good one has done; to bear being injured; to wish to settle a matter by words rather than deeds.”

With growing seriousness he expressed on many occasions his conviction that the difficulties in the Church were caused by self-will, by desire to have their own way on the part of men who had grown so heated in their disputes about trifles that ‘they do not know the depths to which they descend;’ it seemed to him that the assertion of self-will went so far sometimes that it could only be described as ‘human wickedness and folly.’ He constantly strove in his private letters and interviews to get men to see the true proportion of things, to realise the effect of their conduct on the world.

He wrote: ‘One of the greatest forms of testimony which the Church can bear is to show the world that it is the home

of a temper which has its roots in something which is far beyond the world and its ways.'

His great difficulty was to know how to treat the recalcitrant clergy who had refused to follow his directions. Speaking to his diocesan conference he said :

'I smile when I open my letters, and constantly find myself earnestly exhorted to put down immediately particular things and particular persons. I am surprised at the readiness which I am sorry to say seems to exist in the minds of some people to reinstate the Inquisition, and to clothe the Bishop of London with the power of Inquisitor-General. I can only say that I do not believe in the Inquisition, and that there is no post which I would less willingly occupy than that of Inquisitor.'

He was keenly desirous to avoid prosecution. He wrote : 'It is abhorrent to all my views to proceed against an excellent clergyman for his ritual.' He tried to show the wisdom of submission. 'The extreme party would enormously strengthen themselves by showing that they were willing to obey. This would destroy the outcry about lawlessness, and would create sympathy for them. They would set an example to the other side which they would be bound to follow in the way of levelling up. This is the great good which I hope ultimately to get out of the "Crisis."'

But he knew that the extreme party itself did not altogether object to the idea of prosecution. 'Behind them stands an amount of vague belief that it would not be a bad thing for somebody to be prosecuted as a protest. Of course there is always popular sympathy for a sufferer.' In his opinion 'ritualists had always won by prosecutions; and the fact that the protestants knew this gave an air of unreality to their tactics, for 'they did not dare to prosecute themselves and would do nothing but abuse the bishops for not prosecuting.' The only wise method by which the bishops could proceed was that of persuasion. 'They are dealing with tendencies of thought which require gentle handling. Men who have gone further than they intended can easily be stratified into obstinacy, but can only gradually be persuaded to withdraw from a position which has to be proved to be untenable.' Again, 'There are only two ways of dealing with

religious opinions, that of Gamaliel and that of the Inquisition. I always regard Gamaliel as the first exponent of liberal opinions.'

On another occasion he wrote to a correspondent who asked whether, in the view of a general election, a clear representation of church issues and their difficulties might not be useful.

' July 27, 1900.

' It seems to me that the question of legislative interference with opinions ought to be considered on general grounds. When people feel strongly, they think that they can achieve their purpose by sharpening penalties. Where opinions are concerned this has always been a fatal mode of procedure in England. Anything that resembles persecution provokes resistance, gives undue importance to the opinions attacked, and creates popular sympathy with those who seem to differ for conscience sake. The way to deal with erroneous opinions is to drag them to light, to force them to state themselves definitely, and to prove their scanty basis. Opinions die out for want of support, and people cease to support them when they see their consequences. A foolish view is only confounded by being confronted with a wise one. The legislation to try for is, I think, the formation of a representative synod of the Church, including the laity. The formation of such a body would pit the undoubted opinion of the Church against individual eccentricity.'

His policy was to go on with his unwearying efforts of persuasion, with his attempts to get men on both sides to understand the real points at issue, and to avoid new causes for irritation. To a request that he would allow the use of incense on Easter Day, he answered :

' London House : March 31, 1900.

' My dear Mr. Westall,—I quite understand your wishes. But I am bound to ask you " Is it worth while ? " Your action will be published, will be commented on, and resented as being contrary to your undertaking. I shall be asked about it, and shall have great difficulty in explaining it. You and your people made a sacrifice, in your own eyes, for the sake of general peace. This is a worthy thing to do. My advice is : Do not extenuate that sacrifice and its efficacy by anything which may be represented and regarded as an outbreak of petulance.'

‘London House: April 3, 1900.

‘My dear Mr. Westall,—You are always so kind and good to me that you will understand a parable.

‘I always wonder what horses think about a coachman. I imagine that they think him stupid, unjust, particular about unnecessary trifles, and always checking them needlessly. But his business is to get the coach along without upsetting it. He is on the box, and sees more than anybody else. He is not responsible for the obstacles in the road, and if he could regulate *all* the traffic, he could make things easy all round. But alas he is limited to the obscure and ignoble duty of steering his own vehicle to the best of his power.’

He was careful to check at the outset all possible disturbances. Mr. Kensit, whom he described as ‘wishing to keep himself notorious,’ had decided to protest against the ordination of certain candidates. The Bishop’s quiet way of meeting his protest speedily reduced him to silence, and the majority of the congregation in St. Paul’s were not aware that a protest had been made. Insolent letters from Mr. Kensit bidding him do his duty were left unanswered.

Details of ritual might appear to be the chief cause of the prevailing agitation; these could not be neglected, but the Bishop’s interest was with the currents of thought of which these things were but the symptom. He wrote in February: ‘My object is to go on recalling everybody to the real issues which must be faced, enlarging steadily the basis of agreement, and defining the principles which must determine the points of difference. Progress on this line is slow; but there is progress, and every step taken in this direction is permanent.’

His visitation this year gave him opportunity to state his views. He departed from the customary method by deciding to charge his clergy before he received the answers to the questions which he had addressed to them. He said: ‘I wish to feel myself quite free in expressing my own opinions on matters of grave importance, and I could feel this better if I were avowedly speaking from general impressions rather than particular information. I wish to avoid the appearance of addressing admonitions to particular bodies of the clergy.’ When he had received the answers to his questions from the clergy, he intended to communicate

with them privately on any points which seemed to require it. He delivered his Charge in St. Paul's Cathedral on February 21. He wrote to his niece the next day: 'I delivered an enormous Charge yesterday to my clergy, and found it less trying than I supposed to speak for an hour and a half in St. Paul's. It will now afford material for everyone to attack me for a fortnight till they forget it.'

In this Charge he said that he was constrained to leave the many topics connected with the peculiar problems raised by London, and consider how present controversies might be lessened by a fair statement of the real points at issue. To show why certain tendencies within the Church were viewed with suspicion, he said that it was necessary to consider what had happened at the Reformation. Men, stirred by an awakened national consciousness had then 'demanded that the ecclesiastical system should be in accordance with their knowledge, and with the sense of responsibility for their own life and actions which passing events forced upon them.' The English people are not primarily interested in theological questions 'from a strictly theological point of view; but they regard with suspicion any form of theological opinions which they think even remotely threatens that idea of freedom which they rightly hold dear.' He had often said that the practices which the so-called Catholic party wished to revive were those of the mediæval not the primitive Church; and now he pointed out that at the Reformation the Church of England had withdrawn from the error of the mediæval Church, which tried 'to produce by external means the outward appearance of a Christian life without the inward conviction on which alone such a life can be based,' to 'the solid ground of primitive practice.' To steer the way between too great love of antiquity and an undue disregard of the past, we must recognise 'the true temper of the Church of England, and hold to that as our guide.' People mean by the principles of the Reformation 'those changes in the mediæval system which made for liberty and for the training of the individual to a sense of his responsibility in the sight of God.' If all that was incidental and trivial were disregarded, recent controversy would be found to be concerned with two matters regarded as cardinal points at

the Reformation—‘the restoration of the primitive conception of Holy Communion for the mediæval conception of the mass, and the abolition of the disciplinary requirement of confession as necessary before communion.’ He described the abuses which had made the reformers so determined once more to ‘turn the mass into a communion;’ the object which the Church of England had ever pursued was ‘to make the Holy Communion a service for the people, to which they came prepared to receive the gifts of grace in the way which Jesus had appointed. Our own time has seen a fuller accomplishment of that object than any previous period has witnessed. . . .’ It is greatly to be regretted that this advance towards the due appreciation of the mind of the Church should be checked by anything which even remotely suggests a desire to return to that conception of the Holy Communion which was so pernicious. It was that conception which in the sixteenth century was denoted by the use of the term mass. . . . ‘Few things have done more mischief than the needless use of this word, partly from a modern tendency towards brevity, but more from a desire to obliterate old distinctions, and to restore unity by agreement in words when there was no corresponding unity in the thing signified.’ This, and the desire to enforce fasting communion as obligatory, created suspicion, and put hindrance in the way of adapting the services of the Church to the requirements of modern life. ‘By calling a custom a “catholic custom” you do not exempt it from the necessity of reasonable explanation. Customs were framed as helps, not as hindrances; they were not meant to be burdens to generations whose habits of life had changed.’ He had never approved of the attempt to enforce fasting communion, which seemed to him wanting in common sense. He pointed out in this Charge that ‘the ancient rule of receiving the communion fasting had arisen when the habits of the people were very different from those of the present day, and that ‘if we set up an ancient rule as universally binding, we forget its relation to the facts of the life of those for whom it was framed.’

In speaking of confession he said that he had no fear of Englishmen again becoming priest-ridden; ‘the position of the Church of England is that confession is left to every

man's discretion,' his 'liberty should be respected on all sides ;' confession should not be 'urged on the young and impressionable, but is to be left to the discretion of those whose minds are mature.' Those who were alarmed at the increase of confession ought to investigate its causes, 'the bustle and hurry of modern life which produced a sense of helplessness, and the decline in parental authority, proceeding largely from the decay of family religion.'

He insisted that the principles of the Church of England must be fully stated and loyally acted upon. He called attention to the obligation to say morning and evening prayer daily in every church. 'The universal adoption of this plain direction of the Prayer Book would do more to bring us all together in a proper understanding of our common duty than anything else. It would be a blessing to the spiritual life of the clergy.' Holy days should be observed. 'The many lessons to be learned from them should not be forgotten.' Loyalty to the Prayer Book demands that the Athanasian Creed should be said as appointed. 'There is a mutual tendency for everyone to think that his own deviations are obviously excellent,' but 'danger begins when each man undertakes to judge his own cause and dispenses himself from the need of too strict obedience. . . . There are many points on which the wishes of the clergy and the congregation may have free power of choice ; but such points must not affect the system and the principles of the Church.' He concluded with an appeal for agreement. 'Let us be men enough to agree. There is only one possible basis of agreement—the frank acceptance of the historic position of the Church of England, based on a recognition of its great possibilities in the future. . . . Much has happened lately that has given us all great food for reflection. Surely we have felt the meaning of our national life more clearly than we ever did before—its meaning not only to ourselves, but to the world. . . . I recognise the germs of a noble aspiration in attempts to break down England's insularity by schemes for the corporate reunion of Christendom . . . but plans for structural unity hinder that unity of spirit which must come first. They repel many more than they attract. Outward forms are but coverings, charity grows

from within. The great hindrance to the growth of charity is want of confidence in one another's intentions. . . . I feel profoundly how great a responsibility, how heavy a strain, is cast upon us of this generation. . . . With the cry sounding in our ears, "Arise, shine," how can we waste time by disputing about the shape of our lanterns?'¹

At the diocesan conference in May, he said that the Church Congress and his visitation had given him so many opportunities of airing his opinions that he did not mean to say much. He spoke chiefly of the proposal to hold a round table conference about the matters in dispute in the Church. He considered it of great importance. 'It is quite true that controversy is deplorable; but it is equally true, when we regard the constitution of the human mind, that when questions are raised there should at all events be some approximate solution arrived at. Of course the solution is always approximate. We fall into the mistake constantly of thinking that because there is a problem, there must be an answer; that because a question is raised, it must be settled. But as we regard the history of mankind we see that, unfortunately or fortunately, as the case may be, very few questions have ever been settled, and they certainly never have been settled in the way in which each side wished them to be settled.' What was necessary to arrive at in controversies was 'the practical point embodied in them'. . . the limits within which any definite system was workable. . . . The system of the English Church must, at all events, be so clear and definite that it is somehow or other workable and the main question at issue at present is whether or not there are divergencies from a central system so large as to threaten to make that system unworkable.' To discover a workable basis for the Church of England seemed to him what should be aimed at by conference. To meet and discuss would teach a great deal about the opinions of others which could be arrived at in no other way, 'things which seemed perfectly remote from our minds when we read them simply as so many propositions become more tolerable to us when we see them expressed in the form of flesh and blood and clad with the sympathy

¹ Published in *The Church and the Nation*.

which one human soul always carries to another.' Conference also would lead to 'the definition and appreciation of catch-words' which so often tended to 'give vitality to controversy ; it would teach that, principles can be held in many different forms.' 'The great fault that can be brought against the Church of England is that it has shown a very decided reluctance to make room for new exhibitions of the working of spiritual powers. . . . I am very sorry indeed for every departure that was ever made from the Church of England in this country, and I would have wished that those who regulated the destinies of the Church at each of such crises should have made many more concessions than they did, and should have been willing even, if it were necessary for a time, to depart from the assertion of principles which were of great importance, trusting that those principles, if they really were of the importance that they thought, would replace themselves in view of the experience of the coming time ; we can always recover things, and if things are eternally true, then the eternal truth will inevitably prevail. . . . The question comes to be this—cannot we better deal with diverging tendencies which we object to, which we hope to overcome, and which we want to put straight, by retaining them within the system of the Church and thereby subjecting them to the growing spiritual experience of the whole body ? . . . I particularly dislike much of the language which has been used in recent controversy, which draws a line between those who are loyal and those who are disloyal to the Church of England. Do we really suppose that there is any test of loyalty except a man's own internal consciousness of it ?' The Bishop's appeal for comprehension carried the conference with it, and a resolution, moved by Prebendary Webb-Peploe and seconded by Lord Halifax, 'that this conference request the President to appoint a round table conference, consisting of members of the Church of England, on ritual and the doctrines involved therein, to name the members, and to fix the terms of reference,' was carried unanimously.

One of his clergy (the present Dean of Peterborough) writing to the Bishop after the diocesan conference said :

'During the past forty years I have attended a good many conferences of various kinds, but I cannot recollect one

where the spirit and tone and temper were so good. Men surely spoke with a self-restraint and consideration for others which are not too common ; that we owe much of this blessing to the fact that men in the diocese are more and more trusting their Bishop I feel quite certain.'

The following letters deal with current controversies. The train of thought is not always complete, because some of the letters merely filled up gaps in a previous conversation.

' Fulham Palace : January 25, 1900.

' Dear Dr. Cobb,—I do not think that it would be well for me to take any part in recognising a special church society, however much I might personally agree with its object. May I put my point this way ?

' We all wish to be free to work for the future. I do not think that we are *really* fettered by Acts of Parliament. But certain permanent principles were laid down at the Reformation. Those principles concerned the maintenance of individual freedom on the basis of personal religion. Now the real question raised at present is this. Do, or do not, the changes lately made in the accustomed way of performing the services introduce tendencies which are opposed to those fundamental principles ?

' I mean, progress can only be made when all that is good in the past is retained—we do not want to subvert 1559, but to absorb it, and go beyond it.

' Can it be said that the arguments recently used are such as to convince reasonable men that this is the object pursued ? No one can stop development—but we must know what we are developing. We may add to the wisdom of the sixteenth century, but we cannot put that away in favour of the ignorance of the fourteenth century.'

' London House : February 2, 1900.

' My dear Dr. Cobb,—I agree with your views, with this modification. The nonconformists and other objectors to the Church confuse two things—the position of the Church in itself and the existence of any religious organ in the nation.

' On this latter point their position is not quite sincere. They are committed to the cry of "Free Church." This does not correspond to the wishes of the English people. Take one example. The farewell to the London Volunteers in St. Paul's raised no question and satisfied everybody.

' If we were disestablished it would be impossible. We

could no more slip into the American plan than we could into the Roman plan. We could not get up a pandenominational service. Again, at present I am struck by the way in which the most advanced nonconformists will fall in under me for public purposes, simply because I am Bishop of London.

‘If we were disestablished this would cease, and co-operation would become less possible. A national system must always be exposed to criticism, such as a voluntary system escapes. We must take this into consideration.

‘But a national system must be true to its original compact with the State. The objection to the ritualists is not so much for what they do, but for the grounds on which they do it. These are opposed to the letter and spirit of the Church.

‘As you say, this fact must be dragged into light; and then it will perish. They know this, and carefully abstain from co-ordinating their views with the historical position of the Church.

‘We are coming to a point when this is impossible.

‘They pleaded before the Archbishop about the meaning of the Ornaments Rubric. When decision was given, they said, “Oh, you have overlooked the only thing of importance—the binding power of Catholic custom.” It is obvious that each man claims to decide “Catholic custom” for himself. This claim has only to be made manifest to ensure its disappearance.’

To the Rev. F. L. Boyd

‘London House : March 6, 1900.

‘You ask a very large question, which requires a great deal of straightening out.

‘The Jews were always a Church, and only in a secondary sense a State. This is also true of the Russians at the present day.

‘But the question is, what do you want to prove?

‘The Christian view comes from St. Paul: “The powers that be are ordained of God.” The middle ages held that all power came from God, and that human regulations designated the persons who were to exercise it. It was their duty to enforce God’s law. But the question came, Who was to interpret that law? The Pope said “I am.” The Emperor said, “I existed before you, and was ordained of God before you were in being.” Then you get the question “In what sense and within what limits are a body of men chosen to perform divine service, better qualified to interpret God’s law for the conduct of human affairs than those who

are chosen to conduct those affairs on behalf of the community?"

'This last is the question which we mean by "Church and State"—at least we mean a portion of the community claiming on some grounds to have a greater knowledge of God's will on one side, and the rest of the community on the other.

'One wanders in an endless fog without careful definitions at each step.'

To the Rev. F. L. Boyd

'London House: March 8, 1900.

'Dear Mr. Boyd,—. . . My fog about Church and State is as great as anyone else's. I think that confusion arises because we try to deal with the question in the abstract, whereas it is always concrete. I mean that the question "What relations ought to exist between Church and State?" is insoluble apart from the question "What is the organisation of the particular Church and the particular State you are talking about really?" We may lay down a definition: "The State is the community organised for the purpose of securing the most commodious arrangement of common life." "The Church is the community organised for the purpose of maintaining and upholding the divine laws on which all human life depends."

'If those two were co-extensive and worked in the same way, there would be no collision.

'But (1) the State is concerned with what is expedient: the Church is enunciating principles which are frequently threatened by expediency.

'(2) The State for its purposes requires the widest statement of opinion about expediency: the Church has a deposit of principles which it is bound to preserve.

'(3) The State tends to become more democratic: the Church is monarchical or oligarchic.

'These necessities of the case create collisions. I might go further and say:

'(4) Expediency allows of the isolation of particular facts. "Here is a grievance felt by some, why not remedy it?" Principle says, "No, your remedy would create dislocation of a general attitude towards life which must be upheld."

'Hence frequently a man may be in doubt. On the arguments before him, as a matter of expediency, he tends in a certain way. He is doubtful how that action would affect primary principles which he wishes to maintain.

'In your case of Uganda and India, the question is not

so much one of Church and State as of Government to the races whom it governs. It is a relation of tutor to ward: what is the wisest course to pursue?

‘But this involves, if applied to England, the same conception, which is not true. The State with us is the nation. The Church, as expressing the Christian consciousness, is also the nation: as claiming inalienable rights of its own it is not the nation. I tend to think that in every case you must first determine the respective claims of Church and State on the nation. Then things are clearer.’

To the Rev. Canon Barker

‘London House: May 19, 1900.

‘My dear Canon Barker,— . . . About our conversation the other day may I put this point?

‘Our individual life is of no moment; we should always be willing to sacrifice it: but our national life is quite different. We may not do anything which imperils it. We can only reach humanity through the nation to which we belong. How to bring that nation always into line with humanity is an object of philosophic aspiration which disappears when a practical decision has to be made.’

‘London House: May 23, 1900.

‘Let me supplement my abstract propositions by a few which are equally abstract.

‘In the relation of the individual life to the national life there are two processes: the formative and the operative. We try to make our influence felt in the formation of the ideas which rule national life—but when that national life acts in any particular matter, its operation naturally omits much that we are striving to impress upon it. Any action is rude and unsatisfactory and expresses only what comes to the top from time to time. The same considerations which prevent me from recognising my personal life in the national life, prevent me from recognising the life of humanity in the national life. All these relations exist, and we must strive for them all, but we must admit the inevitable limitations. A piece of sugar will sweeten a glass of water—pour the glass into a pond its influence is scarcely felt—drain the pond into a river and the sugar is forgotten. That is no reason why we should not each of us sweeten our glass. We are only bewildered when we peep into other people’s glasses and think of ponds and rivers.’

‘London House, : May 26, 1900.

‘We really both agree: but I am seeking to find what is the value, not of my moral sense in itself, but of the

application of its principles to current questions. I am trying to discover the process by which a moral evolution is being carried on. As an integral part of that process one struggles to do one's best, and is perpetually disappointed. One only regains hope by some criticism, from an outside point of view, of the whole process of development. This attempt at criticism is always chilling and apparently self-contradictory to another.'

'Fulham Palace : May 20, 1900.

'... I do not like the condition of our national sentiment at all. We are ignorant and refuse to learn. We are arrogant and refuse to sympathise. We believe in our general capacity : we rejoice in our national wealth. I think that in a few years our wealth will diminish in comparison with that of the United States : our commerce will be threatened by German competition, founded on better education and receptive intelligence. We must urge these considerations—and must not settle down, to live in a fool's paradise. I feel that the next ten years will be a very critical period for England. Much depends on the wisdom and zeal of such men as you. That is enough to work for. We must get a higher standard—more spiritual, for so only can it become nobler.'

The Bishop, like everyone else, was much occupied with thoughts of the war. At the brief service of farewell to the City of London Volunteers held in St. Paul's Cathedral, he spoke to the men, and his few words—he spoke but for a short five minutes—went home to everyone. He told them the truth burnt in on his own mind by the experience of the last weeks : 'A great need is a great opportunity and a period of national trial is a test of national qualities ;' and he bade the men go in humble steadfastness, feeling that they bore England's honour with them.

In January, speaking to a gathering of principals and lecturers in training colleges, he said :

'It must be confessed that our intelligence in this country would very distinctly bear improvement. Perhaps a year ago we would have denied that fact. Now we are learning a little humility, and it is to be hoped that that humility will not be allowed to effervesce too soon. I hope the nation will see that we must try to improve our intelligence from top to bottom. We had settled down on our assured achievements, and we had not been adequately increasing them ; we had got into idle ways ; we had regarded ourselves as spoilt children,

and had ventured to assume that the Englishman's position in the world was secure so long as the world lasted. We have now got to reconsider some points in that estimate of ourselves.'

On March 6, he preached at a service of intercession in the Chapel Royal, and warned his hearers not to be like the sick man who forgets the lessons of sickness so soon as health returns. 'Now that success seems within reach are we to return to our old self-confidence, or have we grown wiser and softer for the experience we have gone through?' He said, that to denounce war was useless. 'Our own pride, arrogance and self-seeking are its cause . . . the war that has befallen us is in a sense everyone's fault. . . . We are praying for peace, but for peace after our own success. What a weight of responsibility that involves!' . . . 'The war has given us a quickened sense of national life, of the mission and destiny to which God has called us. . . . Our prayer must be that we may have a new grasp of truth through our calamities, that a wider, purer, nobler England, with broader sympathies and a more resolute love of justice, may be the outcome of the crisis through which we are passing.' Speaking soon afterwards at an East London Church Fund meeting, he said: 'The war has revealed to us feelings, powers, energies called forth at a particular crisis in the nation's history. . . . I long to see these lessons regularly applied to other issues as important. . . . We have to fight for the kingdom of God.' At a missionary meeting he asked, 'What is the meaning of the British Empire . . . why are we the foremost nation in carrying the means of communication to other nations? It must surely be for a purpose; we must know and face the responsibilities of empire . . . we must spread the best and the most beneficent ideas, the ideas of the Christian Church.'

He caused a book of public, private and family prayers for use during the war to be drawn up. Some phrases used raised a discussion about prayer for the dead.

To the Bishop of Winchester (Dr. Randall Davidson)

'Fulham Palace : January 18, 1900.

'Dear Bishop,—I do not like to seem vague about the question of prayer for the dead. But the principle that we recognised was that the Church of England held no theory

about the intermediate state which could be interpreted to admit of prayer as a mitigation of purgatory. In making mention of the departed, it coupled them with the living, so as to exclude any notion of a special benefit for them apart from ourselves. It recognised the only passage in Scripture which can be held to bear on that point: "The Lord give him mercy in that day."

'The petition that we and they alike might be admitted to final rest in paradise is recognised in substance in the Prayer Book. It seemed to me possible to apply that to special circumstances.

Early in this year he wrote the report of a committee which had been formed at his suggestion to consider the safe custody, arrangement and accessibility of the documents belonging to the various dioceses. He had sent the following letter to all the bishops in England:

'My dear Bishop,—

'Fulham Palace: December 5, 1899.

'Committee on Bishops' Registries

'Might I ask you for the information of the committee to send me an answer to the following questions?

'1. In what room or rooms are the records of your diocese preserved?

'2. To whom do these premises belong?

'3. Are they well adapted for the purpose? Are they large enough and suitable for reference? Who is responsible for their maintenance?

'4. Are there any premises belonging to the Church which might be more suitable?'

The report on the replies received drawn up in his own handwriting was presented to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, and in consultation with them a short Bill was framed to make better provision for the custody of diocesan records. The Bill passed the House of Lords in the spring, but went no further; the diocesan records, many of them public documents of value and importance, are still in many cases housed in such a way as to be neither safe nor readily accessible.¹

The Bishop had also interested himself in the care of other local records, and had a question asked in the House

¹ This question has lately (1904), at the motion of the Bishop of Peterborough, again received the attention of the bishops in Convocation.

of Commons which led to the appointment, in November 1899, of a committee of which he was chairman to inquire into the matter. He interested himself much in its work, writing himself to foreign students for information.

To Count Balzani

‘ Fulham Palace : July 10, 1900.

‘ My dear Balzani,—I wrote to you some time ago about a plan which I had started for constituting local archives in England. I prevailed on the Government to give me a committee on the subject. Before framing our report, we wish to have some information about the method pursued in other countries. Can you tell us what is done in Italy? If not, will you ask somebody who can? I send you for this purpose a copy of the questions which we sent out to all county and municipal authorities and societies in England. They will serve to show you what we want to know. . . . I seem to have had more than ever to do of every sort and kind. Local archives are hardly my business, but I raised the question, and am bound to see it through. I have just finished sitting on a royal commission to constitute a new University of London, and I am now on another parliamentary committee about Queen Anne’s Bounty Board. So my public duties are considerable, apart from all my other work.’

At the end of the year he sketched the outline of a report of the committee’s work, but it did not prove possible to issue the final report till October 1902. It was based on the lines laid down by the Bishop, and speaks of the active interest which he took in the work, and of the privilege which it had been to work with him. The report was studiously moderate in the recommendations it made for the better preservation of precious documents, in many cases ill cared for and exposed to serious risk of destruction, but has not led to any action being taken.

The following are extracts from the Bishop’s letters to his nephews and nieces during the early months of the year :

‘ *January 27.*—Last night I was giving prizes to the students of a polytechnic. That is rather nice in its way ; there were lots of girl students in various things. They looked very eager and smart.’

‘ *February 5.*—I am very gloomy about the war, and Parliament is not cheerful, and no one seems to want to make

things better or be wise about it. I suppose we must wait in patience.'

'February 7.—We have the Bishops of Lincoln and Chichester staying, and had a large dinner party last night and another to-night. This is severe after a hard day's work. . . . Ella and I go for a walk when we can. On Sunday afternoon we wandered through the City, which is impossible on week days owing to waggons which block up the side streets; but on Sundays all is quiet, only a few boys are visible, and all the bustle has ceased. It is a very funny contrast. On Saturday we went to a lovely concert. You never stayed at London House. It is a good place to get about from. I can get more chances of walking to my business, wherever it may be.

'I rather enjoy a dinner party, and talking to people.'

'February 15.—I have read "Francesca and Paolo." It has some good lines, and is real poetry. Of course the point of a tragedy is to represent the individual as the victim of an overmastering fate. It is sad to contemplate two persons being swept away to their doom. But the answer to the pathetic suggestion of tragedy is, that if people let themselves be swept away by their own feelings, they perish. Tragedy may make you pity the victims as much as you like, but it has to show that they bring about their own destiny. Those who break the laws of life must suffer. It is no good to say that the temptation is strong; the penalty has to be paid.

'This is only one side of the explanation of human suffering. Suffering is enforcing law; and those who will not obey the laws of nature and of God are being silently removed. It was necessary that Francesca and Paolo should be slain; there was no other end possible.

'You raise another question about the keen enjoyment of beauty in nature. You say that —— calls it "pagan." She is justified in doing so in a sense: but it is a question of degree. It is like worldliness, which does not mean taking care about business, and being prudent, &c., but means doing those things by yourself, and for yourself, and *leaving God out*. It only becomes wrong when you leave God out. So with all pleasures and enjoyment. If it is only your own sense of joy, with no uplifting thought behind it, then it is pagan. But it seems to me that delight in nature is of all things one that most appeals to one's higher nature, and suggests a power above ourselves. So it is with other things. Many mistakes have been made by good people, who think that goodness consists in going against human nature. St.

Paul speaks with honour of the "body," but warns against "the flesh." Many people confuse the body and the flesh, and seem to think that all that concerns the body is bad. This view has done a great deal of mischief and is quite untrue.'

'*February 22.*—I quite sympathise with you when other people make idiotic remarks. It happens to me often. I am quite cheery and hopeful. Then comes a tiresome letter : it is not tiresome because it raises a difficult question—I am always ready for that—but because it drags me to a lower level of thought and feeling. It is the sudden drop into another atmosphere, which is depressing. Hence it makes so much difference who are the people one sees most of. It is vain to make an atmosphere for oneself if other people are always smoking bad tobacco.'

'*March 1.*—Each year one grows older, Lent becomes more real. Young people do not like to think about sin and penitence. They do not feel the need so much, as life's lights and shadows are not so strongly marked and all looks more equal.'

'*March 20.*—We have all been cheered up immensely lately. The effect on London of the Queen's visit was amazing. She herself was amazed, and said, "This is greater than the Jubilee."'

Standing with his chaplain in the crowd, to see the Queen pass, on one of the days of her visit, the Bishop noticed a child who was too small to be able to see ; so he gave his chaplain his hat to hold, and lifted the child to a safe seat on his shoulder whence it could see everything.

'*March 24.*—On Wednesday I went to a very interesting dinner at Mr. Chamberlain's, to meet the Australian delegates, who are here to advise the Government about Australian Federation. This is a very large matter, of great importance, and the dinner was really an historic occasion. I was the only person not an Australian, except members of the Cabinet, present. I was rather proud of being the one outsider. . . . I sat all yesterday as a judge, and had to decide a question of libel which was referred to me. I succeeded in getting the case done in the day, and gave a long decision. It is rather amusing doing some legal work sometimes.'

'*March 31.*—I am pining to get away, and shall flee as soon as I can ; Monday or Tuesday in Holy Week. It seems wicked to run away at that time, but I must take all the holiday I can get.'

'*April 7.*—I am pining for a holiday. I have never recovered since December, and it is time that I did improve a bit. I do not want to sink to a crock, just yet.'

On April 10 we went with one of our sons to the Italian Lakes, and wandered from one quiet place to another, taking as usual many long walks. He was not well. For some months he had had frequent attacks of internal pain. This affected his spirits somewhat, though his energy and his interest in everything he saw was as great as ever.

To Mrs. Aldridge

'Menaggio: April 22, 1900.

'Nothing has gone quickly in this war as yet; and I am afraid of trying to act as prophet. We can only hope that two months may see the end. It was natural for Jack to feel glum at seeing other officers find their wives at Capetown. But those wives are a horrid nuisance there, and cannot find themselves very comfortable. I cannot imagine a more unpleasant place than Capetown at present, yet people will go out. I heard of a lady going because she said, "London is so dull: everybody is away. I shall try Capetown." Such persons ought to be imprisoned and sent back by the next boat. . . . We have a blazing sun and cool air; hosts of spring flowers, fruit trees in blossom: everything we ought to have. Italy is doing its best for us. I am not very well, and I have not as yet succeeded in recovering. It is a bore, but one has to put up with things as they come. . . . I am one of the worst of ramblers; and try to look as shabby and inconspicuous as possible.'

On April 30 he was in London again.

'*May 11.*—I am dreadfully busy. The month of May is terrible. Yesterday I sat at the Ecclesiastical Commission from 11 to 2, then in Convocation from 2 till 3.45, then I spoke at a meeting at 4: had some tea and went to St. Paul's, where I preached to the soldiers' guild at a mighty service. I came back to supper at 9.30. I have the same sort of day to-day, ending with a dinner at which I have to make a speech. . . . This is very dull, but I am writing in Convocation and making speeches at intervals.'

He helped this year to get up a dinner to Mr. George Smith to do honour to the public spirit and generosity which had planned and carried out the publication of the Dictionary of National Biography. He was also present at

a luncheon given by the Lord Mayor to celebrate the completion of the dictionary.

'May 15.—At present dinners are a burden. I have one every night this week except one. On Saturday I go to Windsor to see the Queen. She sends for me oftener every year, and I am always glad to see her.'

'May 30.—I think we are all rather ashamed of the absurd noise we made about Mafeking. I was at Windsor on the Saturday and saw rather a nice form of rejoicing in the evening. The volunteers of the town and all the boys marched up to the Castle and made a torchlight procession round the great court. Then they formed in line, saluted the Queen with their torches, and sang: "God save the Queen." It was very pretty as a sight. The Queen was very well and very cheery. She forgot to ask about you, which was quite wrong of her. I am very busy and am fleeing for a short holiday at Whitsuntide to-morrow.'

After a visit in Somerset, we went to Dunster for a few days' absolute quiet. He enjoyed it much, though still suffering pain. We took many long walks, and he amused himself whilst walking by composing a poem, a marriage song.¹ It rested his mind by taking his thoughts away from business, and he would pause at intervals and scribble down fresh lines.

'Fulham : June 27.

'It is cold and grey. Summer is tardy. . . . The hay is cut and gets wet every day. It is gloomy, and we rarely smile. I am looking forward to my holiday more than you are to yours. . . . I am always busy, and am hoping that next week will be rather better. The other day I went to a place where there were more smart and beautiful ladies than I have ever seen. It was the opening of Hertford House by the Prince of Wales.

'July 14.—London is hot : business is boring. There are still all sorts of things going on. A garden party at Buckingham Palace last Wednesday was rather nice. . . . We have troops of people in the garden almost every afternoon. A host of national schoolmasters are coming to-day and clamour to be entertained. This is rather tedious. I have talked to too many people lately.'

On June 14 he lectured for the last time in St. Paul's,

taking Savonarola as his subject. He asserted that Savonarola failed because he became a practical politician.

Speaking to the Lay Helpers' Association at Sion College on June 28, he once more expressed his hopes about the Church of England :

'I am not ashamed to call myself an enthusiastic and fanatical Anglican. It is as an ecclesiastical system that I value the Church of England. Its system seems to me infinitely higher than any other, and it is for that very reason that it appears so defective, because the higher its aims the larger are the demands it makes upon its members, and consequently its ideal can seldom or never be realised. This is the very defect of Christianity itself, which always stands at a disadvantage, so far as the consistency of the lives of its adherents is concerned, when compared with other religions, because of the almost intolerable burden of responsibility which it throws upon the shoulders of those who profess it. . . . There are two principles of the highest possible order which are always at war with one another, the principle of freedom, which is necessary to the individual, and the principle of order, which is necessary to the society of which the individual is a member ; there is always a struggle between the sense of freedom and the sense of discipline ; to construct a system which represents the rightful claims both of freedom and order is extremely difficult. It is easy to construct a system in which either prevails. In the Church of England we have a system which equally respects the claims of order and the claims of liberty ; this demands some intellectual knowledge as well as moral training and discipline. . . . Here is the great opportunity of the Church of England fully to realise its position, and for its members to act up to their obligations . . . it offers infinitely the greatest possibilities for the growth of human intelligence, of the moral sense of men, of individual freedom within the order of a divinely constituted society. . . . As a missionary agency it has unique and unparalleled opportunities. . . . Let us consider its opportunities with regard to national life.

'There are three possible relations between Church and State :

'1. The State to be absolutely under the tutelage of the Church—the conception embodied, if not realised, by the Church of Rome. This is entirely antagonistic to all development of human activity.

'2. The State may exist before the Church, and therefore

outside the Church, as in America. Here the objection is that the various religious organisations in competition with one another lose real hold on their principles in their desire to win popular favour, and in the effort to be always up to date, cease to be operative in directing the conscience of the community.

'3. The principle which belongs to us and to the Eastern Church, according to which a church is national without ceasing to be the maintainer of catholic truth, and without sacrificing its principles to small national prejudices and local considerations . . . in this way we stand in an organic relation to the national life of the country . . . this involves the obligation that we should understand national aspirations and undertake to direct them in accordance with the eternal principles of truth and righteousness. . . . The religious teacher never interferes in politics when he asserts the primary principles which should underlie all politics, but he does interfere in politics when he goes on to say what particular policy represents those principles. The cry is continually heard, "Why does not the Church denounce this or that policy in the name of eternal righteousness?" But the teacher of religion, though bound to put forward what are the principles of righteousness with reference to which everything is to be judged, is not thereby constituted to be both judge and jury for trying the particular issue before the country. . . . On the whole, Christian principles have permeated our land more than they have any other country. It is true that our enemies charge us with being hypocrites, and perhaps we are, perhaps we are not so good as we think ourselves, and use Christian principles more to criticise others than ourselves—our present opportunity is to carry these principles further.'

It was in accordance with these ideas that he joined with the Bishop of Rochester in writing a letter about the elections to the new municipal bodies, urging that men should not vote on party lines, but should elect those likely to aim at promoting the moral and social welfare of the people.

Though he called himself an enthusiastic, he was not a narrow, Anglican, and this July he consented to speak to the conference of the Christian Endeavour at the Alexandra Palace. He was cordially welcomed on the platform by a number of the most distinguished nonconformist ministers. He said afterwards of the gathering that 'the thing seemed genuine, but unregulated.'

To Mrs. T. H. Ward.

‘July 21, 1900.

‘The Christian Endeavour is a society of young people, attached to all denominations that like it, banded together for practical Christian work. They are middle-class—well-meaning no doubt, but with obvious defects. The fault of nonconformity certainly nowadays, probably always, is that its object is to organise forces, not to train character. The keynote of the Endeavour is that if you profess zeal and energy you may do what you like.

‘Oh, I am pining for the country. May you enjoy it.’

A few days later he opened the Pan-African conference, a gathering of representatives of the native races of Africa, to discuss the future of the African people. He told them how important it was that they should state their aims and desires clearly, so that the English people might know the definite practical points in which they could help them. He concluded by inviting the members of the conference to a garden party at Fulham.

This month he laid the foundation stone of the new building given by Mr. Passmore Edwards for the London School of Economics, an institution in which, as its first president, he had always taken the keenest interest since it was started by his friends Mr. and Mrs. Sidney Webb. Services, meetings, dinners, public functions of every kind filled the days of that hot July.

To Mrs. Aldridge

‘Fulham Palace : July 26, 1900.

‘We are all going, as you saw us last year, to a house near Keswick, where we spend our time in a sort of boisterous picnic, which I greatly enjoy. Meanwhile you have no notion how dilapidated everybody is. I hope to survive a big dinner to-night : luckily the Prince of Wales is to be there, and he will order speeches to be short.

‘Portinscale : August 16, 1900.

‘We came here a week ago ; the weather began to amend, for the last days it has been most beautiful. I have been going up hills with a vigour which is indecent in so old a man ; but I never can reconcile myself to my age and infirmities. Certainly the country is lovely, more lovely than Wales.’

In many ways he thoroughly enjoyed this time at Portinscale, and walked with the greatest energy. But he suffered

much pain, which constantly kept him awake for a great part of the night. Still he could write the day before we left : ' we have rambled over hills and have enjoyed ourselves, and have found all things nice in this charming country.'

He wrote during these days an address which he had undertaken to give in the autumn at Birmingham, to the Midland Institute, of which he had been chosen president. He took for his subject the need of a greater sense of the value of knowledge.¹

We hoped that further rest in Italy would make him well, and he and I with our eldest son went to join Count Balzani at Gressoney. In the hotel there we found an interesting little circle of Italians, with whom he much enjoyed talking.

To his niece Ella

'Gressoney : September 2, 1804.

' No English ever come here, or anybody but Italians, so it just suits me. It is quite the most beautiful scenery I know, and it is well to be satisfied. . . . Here we are amongst Italian nobles. I have been talking Italian to them all night till my brain reels.'

The last long walk he ever took was from Gressoney down to the station at Pont St. Martin. Thence we went with Count Balzani to stay a few days with Count Pinchia at Ivrea ; but the Bishop was very suffering, and he was glad to get away to Graglia without quite breaking down. There, on the slopes of the Alps, looking over the great plain of Lombardy, he hoped to stay quietly till he felt better. But his suffering grew so severe that after a few days we decided to return home. The doctors whom he saw on his arrival at Fulham were reassuring, and hoped that complete rest and careful dieting for three months would restore him to health.

To his niece Winifred

' Fulham : September 24, 1900.

' I go on being an invalid, and am quite enjoying it in a way. I am so tired of having been uncomfortable all this year, that I am really glad to have to set to work to mend things. I do not think, however, that it will be done in a hurry. So I take it calmly, and wait till a better time comes.'

¹ Owing to his illness this was never delivered ; but it was printed by the Institute and given to its members, and also published in *The Contemporary* and in *Thoughts on Education* under the title of 'A Plea for Knowledge.'

He enjoyed the quiet days, and only grieved when his strolls in the garden were stopped, and no walking, except what was necessary about the house, was allowed. It was a lovely autumn, and we were able to drive out every day.

To his niece Ella

‘October 15, 1900.

‘As regards myself I am leading a nice, lazy life, and am rapidly improving. I never had such a good time in my life. I do not feel equal to much physical exertion, so I am quite content.

‘*November 14.*—I am growing quite learned in the beauties of Richmond Park, where I take a drive very often. It really is most delightful; and now the hawthorn trees are red with berries, and the oaks still keep their foliage, and the effect of the low sun on them and the bracken is quite splendid. I had no notion that one could get so many country effects so near London.’

He loved Richmond Park, and said that to give a foreigner the most intensely characteristic impression of England, he would show him the view from Richmond Hill.

When people began to come back to work he resumed all his usual correspondence, held interviews, and carried on all the work of the diocese as usual; the only thing he could not do was to make public appearances and speak or preach. He often said that he did not think the diocese had ever been so well administered as during his illness, which showed him that the most important part of his work was what could be done quietly at home, so that in future he meant to do much less speaking and preaching.

He had this year reorganised the rural deaneries so that their boundaries might be coterminous with the new municipalities; and he also arranged that in each municipality a special municipal church should be chosen. This was all definitely settled this autumn. In spite of his illness he drove on November 1 to vote at the first municipal elections.

In November he issued the following letter, the last he addressed to his clergy:

‘Rev. and dear brother,—I desire to commend to your consideration the importance of bringing before your people the duty of supporting the foreign mission work of the Church.

‘Many things help to emphasise this work at the present

time. The centenary of C. M. S. kept last year, the bicentenary of S. P. G. now being observed, provide materials for a retrospect which shows an abundant blessing on efforts all too small. Recent events have brought home to us a new sense of the vastness of our national responsibilities. We have undertaken fresh obligations towards the native races of South Africa. The heroism of native converts in China has won universal admiration. On all sides the claim of missionary work to the serious attention of all English people is becoming apparent.

‘I would urge you to make a special effort for the better observance of the approaching St. Andrew’s-tide as a time of humiliation and intercession in every parish of the diocese.

‘I am, your faithful servant and brother,

‘M. LONDON:’

Already whilst at Portinscale he had made preparations for the meeting of the round table conference. The following letters will show what he hoped for it:

To Sir John Kennaway, M.P. ‘Fulham Palace: July 20, 1900.

‘Dear Sir John Kennaway,—I was requested by a resolution of the London Diocesan Conference in May last to summon a round table conference of members of the Church of England to confer on matters which are at present agitating the Church. I would invite you to take part in such a conference.

‘I propose that it should be held here on Oct. 11, 12, 13 next. The subject which I would refer to it for discussion is “The discipline of the Holy Communion and its legitimate expression in ritual.” I sincerely hope you may be able to attend.’

Sir John Kennaway asked for more information before giving a decided answer.

‘The Snabs, Carlisle: August 2, 1900.

‘My dear Sir John Kennaway,—I have been so busy that I have not had time to answer your letter before: but meanwhile things have been clearing themselves rather about the proposed conference by the answers which I have received.

‘My object is nothing more than to clear up the points in dispute—to determine what they are—to see how much agreement there is and where difference begins, and on what it is founded. Controversy always seems to me like men fighting in the dark, very few of their blows hit, each supposes the

other to be somewhere where he is not. The first step is to know where you are and where your opponent is.

‘The utmost that I contemplated was a report on these lines :

‘All were agreed (1), (2), (3).

‘Then some thought (1), (2), (3).

‘Their reasons were &c.

‘I did not think it well to prescribe any limitations in the first instance. There can be no doubt that Scripture is the supreme authority ; everything else can only be quoted as interpreting Scripture : the weight assigned to such interpretation is just one of the points which I should expect to be noted. I think that a statement of this kind would do much good, and would compromise nobody. I very much want to have one or two laymen to represent common sense. . . .

‘The only refusals are Preb. Webb Peploe and Mr. Mellor. Professor Ryle is engaged in college business at the time. I have not heard yet from Canon Newbolt and Mr. Birkbeck.

‘I very much hope that you may be able to come. I really think that it would be interesting, and would not be time wasted.’

Sir John Kennaway could not see his way to attend, and Lord Stamford and Mr. P. V. Smith were invited. The Bishop wrote, ‘I want to secure the representation not only of definite parties, but of all shades of thought, so far as possible. Professor Moule recommended Rev. N. Dimock as the theological expert on the Evangelical side.

He wrote further to those who had accepted his invitation.

‘August 28, 1900.

‘I am now able to give you more definite information about the arrangements which I have been able to make.

‘The following have been good enough to accept my invitation : Rev. Dr. Barlow, Rev. H. E. J. Bevan, Rev. Dr. Bigg, Mr. W. J. Birkbeck, Rev. N. Dimock, Rev. Canon Gore, Viscount Halifax, Rev. Professor Moule, Rev. Canon Newbolt, Rev. Dr. Robertson, Rev. Canon Robinson, Rev. Professor Sanday, Mr. P. V. Smith, Earl of Stamford, Rev. Dr. Wace.

‘I propose that all the members of the conference should stay here during the time of meeting. I think that opportunity for private talk between the sittings would be of great value. I hope that all will come in time for dinner at 8 P.M. on Wednesday, October 10. Some agreement about procedure and sittings might be made that night.

‘I would explain that it is not my wish to interfere in the proceedings of the conference, which will make its own regulations.

‘I think, however, that its proceedings would be greatly helped if each member were to send me, not later than October 5, a statement of his belief on the subject of the Divine gift in Holy Communion. The statement should be positive, not negative—what he holds, not what he wishes to exclude.

‘The proceedings of the conference will terminate early on the afternoon of the 13th.

‘There will be a celebration of the Holy Communion each morning during the sessions.

‘We will all prepare ourselves meanwhile by praying that God’s Holy Spirit may enable us to speak the truth in love.’

Some further light on his hopes as to the results of the round table conference is thrown by a letter to Sir William Harcourt. In August he had written privately to Sir William Harcourt about some of his letters to the ‘Times,’ pointing out how a prosecution would hinder rather than promote the restoration of order in the Church. In reply to Sir William’s answer to this letter, he wrote again as follows from Graglia.

‘Graglia : September 13, 1900.

‘Dear Sir William Harcourt,—Your kind letter, for which I am very grateful, followed me abroad, and I feel bound to thank you for it, as I had no intention when I wrote to you to involve you in a private controversy. It is of course quite right that the bishops should be used as whipping posts. It is interesting to notice how the charges against them have changed. A short time ago it was “the proud prelate, who lorded it over the clergy and was kept in his place by the courageous laity.” Now it is “the timid and time-serving prelate, equally afraid of the clergy and the laity.” I cannot but think that there is a great deal of unwritten ecclesiastical history in this violent change of appearances. I will not presume to forecast it.

‘Your position is incontrovertible: your arguments are quite just. There is no reason why your method should not be tried, except that no one wishes to try it, but only to abuse the bishops for not trying it. I can only express my own opinion, that there is no way of combating error except by setting forth truth. Of course it is annoying that any system constructed for teaching opinions should deviate a

hair's breadth from its original standard. But when I reflect on the nature of the human mind, I am not surprised, though I may be annoyed. It is quite necessary that men should obey the law, that they should be subject to authority. If men who say that they are trying to do good, and claim to act through conscientious motives, refuse to do these things, such refusal has wrought great results in the world's history. It has never been overcome by force, or by the application of law. There has never yet been a case in history of an attempt to overcome it by reason, by investigation, by discussion, by definition, by gradual isolation of eccentricity from grains of partial truth. Yet I am foolish enough to believe that this is the only possible method. I should have thought that at least it was innocuous. The talk of a few pedants in a corner could not affect the mighty stream of indignation which swells the English breast, and will work its will through that means which is called *political*. You abuse me for what I do as well as for what I do not do. Your way is the popular way; why not leave mine to do what it may?

'You will say, "No appearance of truce with law-breakers." But do not we want to find why seemingly good men break the law? The plea of law-breaking was used against Wyclif, Huss, Luther, everybody whom we now call reformers. Of course there is no parallel between them and Lord Halifax. Yet I cannot apply to Lord Halifax a kind of treatment which, *mutatis mutandis*, I condemn in Leo X., in Archbishop Courtenay, in the Council of Constance. They all of them refused to discuss the thing in itself; they all upheld the law; they all secured the rapid downfall of the law, and of their method of upholding it.

'I know that you will regard all this as hopeless from a practical point of view. Nobody knows this better than I do. We are both of us idealists. I rank you with Lord Halifax. He is pursuing a revival of old methods of religious thought; you are for reviving the old means of persecuting him. I am so far modern that I do not believe in the vitality of his ideas, or in your mode of suppressing him. I want to drag him into the light and slay him in the open. My interest is more with the Church of the twentieth century than with that even of the sixteenth. 'Yours very sincerely,

'M. LONDON:

'My opinions were not made in reference to present events. I am venturing to send you some lectures which I gave at Cambridge six years ago. [The Hulsean lectures on 'Persecution and Toleration.']'

The Bishop's illness in no way interfered with the meeting of the round table conference. He had never intended to be present at its sessions, but only to be in the house to be referred to if necessary. He was always ready for consultation when wanted, and his presence on his sofa in the drawing-room gave life to the social side of the gathering.

From the outset he had been determined not to give a line himself to the members of the conference. When asked by Canon Robinson in August what they were to do, he answered : ' That is for you to decide ; you will find it will all come out, when you get together.' But, as one of them writes : ' He showed his wisdom in not letting us go off on to legal decisions, courts or their judgments. It was real beliefs and the forms of their expression that he wanted us to work at. . . . He was quite content that we should not formulate new "covering expressions," nor attempt practical compromises. He was delighted that the *positive* statements on each side came so near each other—that it was so often difficult to explain the exact point of divergence. This as an educational result is probably what he had chiefly looked for.' At the end of the conference he said to the members : ' I know you disagree, and I think that you ought to disagree.'

The result of the conference quite satisfied him ; he had never expected that it would lead to any definite resolutions, only to a better understanding of different points of view. In the preface to the published report he said :

' My desire was to bring together various phases of theological opinion as represented by theologians whose training enabled them to talk a common language. The object of the conference was that it should record opinions, not that it should attempt to elaborate new formulæ. The form of the conference was that it was a committee appointed to report to me. It presented its report by submitting a copy of its minutes. . . . I took no personal part in the proceedings, for I felt that any appearance of official intervention would have destroyed their usefulness. . . . It would be out of place for me to make any comment upon the contents of the following pages. They will be most useful to the reader who is his own commentator.'

The tone and temper of the round table conference seemed to justify the hope that a more peaceful spirit might

prevail, but at that very time a new effort was made to return to the old method of prosecution. At the end of September the Bishop was informed that a certain Colonel Porcelli, giving as his address 1 Whitehall Gardens, the National Club, not a private residence, intended to proceed under the Clergy Discipline Act of 1840 against five London clergy. The Bishop at once consulted the Archbishop :

'October 4, 1900.—My intention is to communicate with the clergy accused, and to give full weight to any pleas or undertakings which they may put before me : but I anticipate that in some cases, and under some of the heads, I shall find it necessary to allow proceedings.'

At first all that he hoped was to be able to limit the proceedings to two cases which included all the points complained of. Colonel Porcelli consented to proceed only against two of those named, both men who had refused to obey the Bishop's instructions with regard to the use of incense. But after further consideration the Bishop wrote to his legal secretary, Mr. Harry Lee :

October 19, 1900.

'My dear Mr. Lee,—Would you send me back the papers relating to the prosecution? I see on looking up the Act that I have to be responsible for letting the cases go on. I shall therefore have to communicate with those concerned before I give my assent.'

He felt deeply the importance of the decision that he had to make. Both his reason and his sentiment were absolutely opposed to prosecution. The history of the past taught him how it had invariably failed in its object ; peace could not be reached in that way. And with his almost passionate belief in liberty, with his hatred even of the appearance of intolerance, such a prosecution seemed like a contradiction of the very ideas which all his life long he had striven to uphold. Often during those weeks he would suddenly exclaim : *'That I of all men should be forced to become a persecutor !'* And yet there was the constant question : Could he avoid it in such a way as not to hurt the public conscience by an apparently unjustifiable use of his power of veto. This was the problem ; it needed time and observation of men's minds

to solve it. He did not vacillate, he waited and observed. The following are some of his letters on the subject :

To Lord Edward Churchill ' Fulham Palace : November 10, 1900.

' My dear Lord Edward Churchill,—The ordinary phrase, "the Bishop's Veto," has always seemed to me entirely misleading.

' A bishop receives a formal complaint, and has a legal discretion about giving leave to take legal proceedings.

' This discretion applies

' (1) To frivolous and vexatious proceedings.

' (2) To cases in which those who are complained against give satisfactory assurances for the future.

' As regards any given charge the bishop can only judge on these two points.

' My own opinion on the matter of prosecutions is very simple. It is simply founded on the experience of the whole history of England. English sentiment has always resented any attempt to suppress opinions, however objectionable, by coercive measures. There is only one remark in your letter which I would ask you to reconsider.

' You regard disestablishment as "a remedy for our present troubles." I wish I could share this confidence.

' Any synodical body would be less liberal than our present system, and the ejection of offenders against rules would be infinitely easier. If we were disestablished at present, we could not possibly hold together.'

To the Bishop of Winchester (Dr Randall Davidson)

' Fulham Palace : November 10, 1900.

' My dear Bishop,—I feel that I have rather a serious responsibility resting on my sole shoulders about allowing prosecution. I had five men presented : I have barred all but two, and the solicitor agreed to this. Now I am communicating with the two, who are identical in position, and are two of the five who refused to make any colourable submission about incense.

' Of course since this has been talked about I have received many letters protesting against a renewal of prosecutions. I see from a letter in the "Times" that the Low Church party deplore it, and that a small body only are acting. But this does not affect the matter as far as my discretion is concerned. My "discretion" is purely legal. . . . A bishop cannot object to investigation by process of law.

' It is not to the point that he should say : "I do not

think it expedient at the present time that any strictly legal decision should be given about anything." This is a claim on his part to a power which seems to me to be tyrannical, never contemplated by the law and quite untenable. Of course everybody disapproves of a prosecution the moment it is started. It means a certain loss to the Protestant party of their present popularity. It means that incense and reservation will in five years' time be in the same class as vestments.

But as everybody has been mean enough to abuse the bishops for using their veto, and for not "putting down" opinions which they know quite well that no Englishman will either stand being "put down" or when it comes to the point will allow another to "put down," I think they must take the consequences.'

To Canon Armitage Robinson (now Dean of Westminster)
(in answer to a letter asking whether he should write to the 'Times' urging reasons against the proposed prosecution)

November 12, 1900.

'My dear Robinson,—By all means send your letter to the "Times." The more the question is discussed the better. Of course the only question before me is that of my constitutional duty fairly interpreted. But it may be proved that people would welcome any way out of a disagreeable and futile position.'

He had friendly discussions with the two clergy concerned, but failed to persuade them to conform to his regulations. After one of the interviews he wrote to the Bishop of Winchester :

'November 16, 1900.

'The position was "I would meet you if I could : but I am not going to be bullied by a handful of Prots." . . . In fact, "Catholic principles" are now in the background, and we are going to have British pluck instead. He will not appear before the Arches Court, and will pay no attention to its sentence. Doubtless he will be ejected by the police ultimately amidst universal sympathy, and no one will be able to work his parish. Two parishes in the slums of East London will be devastated, and then the Protestant fervour will disappear for our lifetime. Incense will come back, and reservation for the sick will become general.

'This will be the result. I will not say whether it will be good or bad. But I do not see how I can prevent it.'

‘ Fulham Palace : November 19, 1900.

‘ My dear Bishop,—Thank you very much. I am sorry to trouble you ; but it is well to have some one to whom one can put things and see one’s way. . . . Perhaps it is a misfortune that I should be interested in constitutional law. For a veto exercised on grounds of discretion seems to me a power unknown in England, and to partake of the nature of tyranny. Having this view, I could only act by saying “ The thing that I do is indefensible, but to prevent a greater mess I do it.” But then I have always been averse from *coups d’état*, and I don’t believe in “ Saviours of Society.” ’

‘ Fulham Palace : November 22, 1900.

‘ Dear Bishop,—It is of course the irony of fate that I should of all men seem to be willing to allow prosecutions ; but that is of no importance.

‘ If I allow proceedings, it will be only in one case, and only on the two points of incense and reservation. . . . My position may not be logical, but it is this. If one prosecution be undertaken as a test case, I do not see that the nature of the prosecutor matters. If, after this, proceedings were taken against others, I should require a parishioner.’

‘ November 25, 1900.

‘ The more I think about prosecution the more I dislike this particular prosecutor, and I think it might be right to bar him.’

‘ November 28, 1900.

‘ I am prepared to allow prosecution by a qualified and interested person. I cannot allow a common informer.’

He received many letters from men of very different church opinions asking him not to prosecute. His two archdeacons addressed a letter to him, which was published, purporting to express more or less the views of the clergy of the diocese, and when he finally decided how to act, it was to them he expressed his decision. He was convinced that a prosecution would stir up again the bitterness which had been slowly diminishing. Discussion in the law courts would not lead men to be tolerant of one another’s opinions. It was not legal decisions, not compromise, but comprehension within the Church, which he desired ; this, time and patience alone could bring about. So he struggled to find a reason for using his veto which would not offend the public sense of justice.

I well remember the relieved tone with which he said when I came into his room one morning, as he was lying in bed, attending to his correspondence : ' I have made up my mind not to allow the prosecution.'

He announced his decision in a letter to the Archdeacons as follows :

' Fulham Palace : November 28, 1900.

' My dear Archdeacons,—I have to thank you for the letter which you were good enough to address to me, in which you expressed, on behalf of the clergy of the diocese, what I am sure you believed to be their almost unanimous desire—that there should not be at the present time any legal proceedings on the ground of ritual.

' Though I share this desire on general grounds, yet I could not allow any personal opinion of my own to affect me in the discharge of an official duty. I have therefore been carefully considering the nature of the legal discretion conferred upon me when a complaint is preferred.

' Now the facts before me are these. Identical complaints against five clergymen have been submitted to me by one person whose address is a London club, and who gives no evidence of his connexion with any of the parishes about which he complains.

' After much reflection I have come to the conclusion that if I were to recognise such a complaint, I should be deviating in a way which I could not justify from the intention of the Legislature of 1874. The Act that was then passed for the special purpose of dealing with matters concerning the conduct of divine service, emphatically provided that complainants must be parishioners.

' On this ground I have found myself unable to allow the present complaint to proceed. I would ask you to explain to the clergy as you may have occasion, the reasons which have weighed with me.'

The same week which saw the conclusion of this matter saw also the settlement of another troublesome problem. The Bishop had often had to settle disputes in connexion with Continental chaplaincies. But none caused him so much trouble as the chaplaincy at Biarritz. Into the details of the dispute it is not necessary to enter. For various reasons the existing chaplain had not met with the approval of the English residents at Biarritz. No serious charge was preferred

against him, but the majority of the congregation insisted on his removal, because they did not like him.

The question is only of interest here because of the light it throws on the Bishop's opinion of the position of Continental chaplains. This is shown in his letters to his assistant bishop, Dr. Wilkinson.

‘ May 4, 1900.

‘ I have had endless trouble about Biarritz. The aggrieved party applied for another chaplain. I looked into this point, and I concluded that if any body of Englishmen resident abroad provided a place for worship, and a sufficient stipend for a chaplain, and applied for my licence for him, I could not refuse that recognition. Wishing to avert a schism, I asked them to hold their hands for this season. But if time does not bring its healing power, they will renew their application, and there will be a second chaplaincy at Biarritz for a time.’

‘ Fulham Palace : November 9, 1900.

‘ I should greatly dislike to license another chaplain at Biarritz. But the precedent would not spread, as there are not many places in which malcontents can afford to find a stipend and a building. I think nothing of opinions, however strong, which people are not prepared to pay for. It is astonishing how they generally fade away before this test.

‘ But the Continent is not like England. In England there is a territorial division, and parishes have rights. On the Continent there live scattered bodies of English people to whom the Bishop of London, in matters ecclesiastical, is *protector*. I do not have jurisdiction over them as over English parishes. I am really more like a visitor. I cannot impose a chaplain. They could have a chaplain without my permission *if they could get him*. In fact, English clergymen abroad are often asked by malcontents to hold a service for them. They answer that without my permission they could not do so. The sanction for this is that, if they did so, I could, and would, prevent them from getting work in England.

‘ But the Biarritz people have raised a question which illustrates the position. They wrote to me that it was hard that I should have this trouble; it ought to fall on the C.C.C.S. Accordingly they have asked the Society to give Mr. — notice to quit, as owners of the freehold property which he occupies. They have sent in French legal opinions to the effect that he would have to go at a fortnight's notice.

I have always held that this is the legal position of a chaplain abroad. He is only protected from this by my interposition. I should refuse to license another chaplain for a society which used its legal right in this way. But then, if a patron reports to me that his property is being spoiled by an unsuitable and incapable man, I cannot uphold him in the face of this.'

The Bishop had had much consultation with some of the leading residents of Biarritz in the summer, and had finally promised to hold a court early in October, at which they and the chaplain could state their respective cases. When the chaplain said that he could not get his case ready in October, the hearing was put off to November 2, and again, at the chaplain's wish, till November 26.

The great hall at Fulham was arranged for the court; both sides were represented by counsel, and the secretary of the Colonial and Continental Church Society was also present. When the Bishop entered he was asked by the counsel on both sides whether he would have a private interview with them and their clients to see whether it might not be possible to arrive at some agreement. He said that it would be very much more desirable, and retired to his study with his own legal advisers, where he was soon joined by the others. After a discussion of an hour and a half, it was agreed that the chaplain should resign in the following June on condition of receiving the annual payment of 150*l.* for five years, and that his resignation was not to prejudice his transfer to another chaplaincy. The Bishop approved of the terms, adding that on their being carried out all matters in dispute were to be considered as closed, and not to be revived.

When they returned to the court, the terms of the agreement were announced, and the Bishop said that the course which had been pursued was especially creditable to the chaplain, and added :

'There have been personal matters which have grown to apparently an impossibility of there being that cordial co-operation between, at all events, some members of the congregation and the clergyman, which is necessary in all cases for the proper efficiency of a congregation, particularly when it is a resident congregation abroad. I am very sensible of the motives which have led Mr. — to take the course which he has now taken. It has relieved me from a responsibility

which I should regret to have had to exercise personally. It is very much better that cases of this kind should be decided by mutual agreement, and I must express my satisfaction that an agreement has been reached in the present case.'

It was a great relief to the Bishop to have been able to settle this matter without a lengthy inquiry, which could only have served to stir up more bitterness, and the residents in Biarritz were extremely grateful to him for the trouble he had taken.¹ All alike were struck with his clearness of mind and capacity for transacting important business, which his illness had not in the least diminished.

Other business of many different kinds was brought before him, and entered into with all his usual sympathy and keenness. He was always ready for a talk with any friend who came to see him, and as usual in general society took the lead in conversation. On the whole, he much enjoyed these quiet months. There were times of depression, when it did not seem to him that he was getting on as quickly as he should, and once or twice he discussed with me whether he ought not to resign. On one occasion when we were driving, he asked me where I should like to live if he had to resign, and we both agreed that we should like a cottage in the Lake district. When I added that it would depend a little upon whether we should be in a position to afford to go about, as it would not be pleasant to be cut off from all our friends, he answered, 'I should not mind how quiet we were as long as I had my books. I should not feel the need of seeing people.'

Some extracts from his letters will show how his mind was occupied :

To his niece Winifred (who was staying at Dresden)

' October 22.

'It is more than thirty years since I was in Dresden. I spent a month there in 1867 and a fortnight in 1869. That was before the war, when Germany was a different sort of place. Life was simple and cheerful. . . . There is no doubt that the San Sisto is the finest easel picture that ever was painted. But a comparison of that and of the Holbein is very useful. There are two elements in art, the ideal and the real.

¹ Unfortunately after his death an attempt was made to go back on the terms of the agreement, but the authorities refused to allow the matter to be re-opened.

The San Sisto is supreme in the ideal region ; but it is well to feel the charms of the real. Holbein's Madonna is a real woman, and her dress is delightful, also her hair. Look at that black velvet and the red girdle and the Turkey carpet in front. They do not appeal to the imagination in the same way, but they are splendid.'

To Miss Mary Bell (now Mrs. Charles Trevelyan)

' Fulham Palace : October 28, 1900.

' My dear Molly,—I am glad to hear that you are comfortably settled. . . . I never was at Weimar in my life, which is sad, as I cannot make a picture of you and Elsa in my mind. . . . I envy you all your opportunities of learning German and painting and music and expanding your mind ferociously. My life is dreadfully monotonous. I get up at 12, and go to bed at 10, and go for a drive every afternoon, and otherwise eat a number of meals, and lie down as much as possible. It is not exciting, but it is so new to me that I quite enjoy it. I never before have had the opportunity of studying a garden in autumn ; and this has been a splendid autumn for the purpose. The roses still blow and the frost has not slain any flowers. I saw some primroses to-day, and a white lily suddenly appeared a few days ago. It is quite odd to see them. I greatly enjoy also my chance of studying the beauties of Richmond Park. They are very great, in fact nothing could be lovelier or more typically English. I am writing this lying down : so excuse the badness of the writing.'

To his nephew Basil

' November 8, 1900.

' My dear Basil,—I am still as before ; at present I am not getting well so quickly as I was, and I am rather gloomy to-day. However it is no good being in a hurry, and one must make the best of it.

' What you say about the dangers ahead to England seems to me sadly true. We began our political and industrial life before other people ; we went ahead very fast : we became quite content with ourselves, we have left off trying to improve things, and we go on living in a fool's paradise. Take this war, for instance. What impresses me is that all the men who ought to have advised the Government, men who were out there and knew the Boers, advised them all wrong. They thought, and said, that 30,000 troops would finish the war in two months. Now the worst thing for any nation is not to judge right. If Englishmen are growing so conceited that

they cannot estimate properly, we are in a bad way. You ask if this can be helped. Yes, it can be helped by the younger generation taking a more serious interest in what they do. You and such as you must set us right, by working harder, by knowing more, by thinking more wisely. Now-a-days the only thing we can do is to grow excited. Really the return of the C.I.V.'s was the most idiotic performance, and I wonder how often we are going to repeat it. Well, you and I have had a good grumble, let us make a compact together to try and mend things, only you must not be turned for construe.'

To Miss Mary Bell

' November 11, 1900.

' My dear Molly,—It is very nice of you to like writing to me. I rejoice in getting your letters. My life is not eventful in outward things: I go on living quietly at Fulham and doing all my business here. I was progressing beautifully till last Sunday. I have now gone back rather, and am stuck for a time, which makes me rather cross. Meanwhile I have all sorts of important business on hand, about which you would, luckily for yourself, feel no interest. Of course everybody in Germany goes to plays, operas and concerts. I wonder which you like better the "Götterdämmerung" or the "Barbiere." There is a great tendency in people who like Wagner to like nothing else. This seems to me a great mistake. We ought not to have only one kind of good thing. Surely the best of all kinds is good. In art, above all things, people ought not to be narrow: but dear me, how we all love to be as narrow-minded as possible, and feel much more interest in reviling what we don't like than in appreciating what we do. The sun is shining on a nice wintry day. I am not allowed to walk at present and am looking at the garden with longing.

' If I told you "not to grow wise," I did not mean you to stop learning. That we can none of us ever afford to do. But there is a difference between *wisdom* and *knowledge*. Knowledge can be gained about anything; but wisdom is concerned with one's own life and character and judgment of the world. Many people think that if they know more they are wiser. But it is possible to be a learned fool. The French have a proverb that no folly is equal to 'la bêtise d'un bel esprit.' I suppose that means that one's wisdom can only grow with one's experience, and that nothing is more futile than to form strong opinions about things which do not really interest us. If we only talked about things which we understood, and had a reason for talking about, we should all

be quite wise. But don't you think that many girls at present talk about things because other people do, or because they think it the right sort of thing, not because they really know or care?'

To the Lady Mary Glyn

'Fulham Palace : November 13, 1900.

'My dear Lady Mary,—Thank you for your kind letter. I am, and have been all along, quite well in all points save that I am condemned to lie down. It is this which prevents me from going about : except for this enforced repose I am quite happy ; and I feel that the see of London has not been so well administered for a long time. I am learning how much more good one does by staying at home than by running about—by holding one's tongue than by making speeches.'

To a young friend

'November 18, 1900.

'You are discovering that it is hard to see one's friends change. It is a real trial. One has to grapple with the feeling of jealousy ; and the sooner one faces it the better. There is only one way of facing it—to be grateful for what one has received, and to feel that the power of loving is independent of any immediate return. Let me put it in this way. To love anybody does me good. It means that I see them as beautiful beings. That is my reward. Why should I demand that they also should see me as a beautiful being? It might be nice if they did, but it is not the material point.'

One of his doctors recalls how when he was asked whether illness had made him irritable, he answered : 'No, I think my behaviour has been particularly good lately. I have felt that I should be justified in being irritable, and this has made me put an extra restraint upon myself.' Another time when all food was distasteful to him, he said : 'I feel I could hate a man who could eat a beefsteak. Now I understand the wrath of a total abstainer when he sees a man drinking a glass of beer. He thinks it is consuming zeal, but it is largely produced by hatred of the man who can drink what he may not drink himself.'

To the Bishop of Winchester

'November 28, 1900.

'I hope to make a new start in recovery on Saturday. I had a consultation yesterday with a surgeon. It is tolerably clear that there is some obstruction requiring an operation.

Don't say anything about it, as an operation suggests a cancerous tumour, which is not suspected. The surgeon hopes to restore me in a fortnight, if his diagnosis is right. He promises to make me as good as new. I am glad to get to a definite point; for I have stuck for the last month, and saw no prospect of advance on these lines.'

The Bishop was suffering from internal ulceration. The doctors had hoped to effect a cure by rest and dieting, and at first he had made rapid progress, but after the beginning of November he did not improve. At last it was determined that an operation was necessary. This was carried out successfully on December 1. But it was followed by serious hæmorrhage, and for some days there was great anxiety. He soon, however, began to gain strength, and for a time all went well. Then he suddenly went back again, and a second operation proved necessary. This took place on December 24, with most hopeful results. His recovery went on steadily, and he was very bright and cheerful; but on learning that he could not hope to be fit for full work till Easter, he decided to proceed at once with the arrangements for the appointment of a new Suffragan. In the preceding summer he had presented Dr. Ridgeway with the City living of St. Botolph's on the understanding, that when Bishop Barry should be obliged to retire from being assistant bishop, he should be consecrated as an additional suffragan. It now seemed best to secure Dr. Ridgeway's services at once, and the Bishop took the necessary steps for his appointment, with the new title of Bishop of Kensington.

On the morning of January 7 he seemed particularly well. His chaplain, Mr. Percival, was with him for a long while, and they spoke of various answers which had been given to the question, What is the greatest danger of the coming century? The Bishop said, 'I have no doubt what is the greatest danger—it is the absence of high aspirations.' He went on to say that he considered the greatest of all centuries to have been the thirteenth, the century which produced Dante, St. Francis, St. Louis, and Edward I. He spoke of the Victorian age as the great philanthropic age, when everybody was eager to do good to others; but said that most people made the mistake of wishing only to do good in their

own particular way. His general conclusion was that he would put first the thirteenth century, then the age of Elizabeth, and third the Victorian age.

That afternoon he did not feel so well, and the next morning there was severe hæmorrhage. The following six days were a struggle between life and death. He was not often fully conscious, but he did not seem as if he wished to live. Everything that the devoted care of the ablest doctors could do for him was done. On Sunday morning, in a brief moment of consciousness, he sent a farewell message of complete devotion to the Queen, and expressed his wish that he should be buried in St. Paul's Cathedral. On Monday morning with 'God' on his lips he passed away.

One of his devoted medical attendants, Sir Thomas Barlow, wrote :

'Let us be thankful he was spared *painful* suffering, and that patience and gentleness was given to him in such great measure. It is not for me to speak of higher things, but there are four men who watched him in the time of trial, who will always believe in him, and to whom his memory will always be green.'

Till Wednesday evening his body lay in the chapel at Fulham, watched day and night by some of his clergy and the Sisters from St. James' Home. Every morning there was a celebration of Holy Communion, and hundreds came to gaze on the beautiful peace of his face. On Wednesday evening we carried his body to the Cathedral which he loved so well, and where no Bishop of London had been buried for 280 years. The great candelabra, which had not been used since the funeral of the Duke of Wellington, stood round the coffin as it rested all night in the Choir, watched by the clergy of the Cathedral.

A mighty congregation representing all classes of the community and many different forms of religious belief filled the Cathedral for the funeral service on Thursday the 17th. The Queen, the Emperor of Germany, the Prince and Princess of Wales, and other members of the Royal Family were represented. The Chief Rabbi, the Greek Archimandrites, and many leading nonconformists, including Dr. Parker, Dr. Clifford, and Mr. F. B. Meyer, were there in person.

The Archbishop of Canterbury committed his body to its grave in the crypt. Two of his favourite hymns, 'Rock of Ages' and 'O God, our help in ages past,' were sung at the service.

It is not for me to dwell on the extraordinary unanimity and warmth of the appreciation expressed on all sides for his life and character. Canon Scott Holland says :—' The outburst of enthusiasm for him was most real and unexpectedly general. He had told. And his immense working power had won hearts to him whom his outward brilliancy might have puzzled and repelled.' Lord Rosebery, who succeeded him as President of the Midland Institute at Birmingham, said, in his inaugural address in October 1901, ' I think the late Bishop of London was perhaps the most alert and universal intelligence that existed in this island at the time of his death.'

It was not only his own Church that mourned him. The Rev. F. B. Meyer, the well-known nonconformist minister, wrote : ' The Bishop was always so kind and generous in his behaviour to me, that I am deeply, personally, bereaved, and there is but one feeling of regret and sympathy in all nonconformist circles.' In the City Temple Dr. Parker had spoken of him with warm admiration, and had prayed for his recovery. The Chief Rabbi, Dr. Adler, wrote : ' None of his clergy could have felt more keenly than I do the loss of my ever to be lamented friend.' Hundreds of societies, lay and clerical, church and nonconformist, literary and philanthropic, passed resolutions showing how highly they valued him.

I will quote one letter only, from Archbishop Temple :

' His large and varied knowledge, his marvellous ability, his devotion to duty, must be missed by all of us incessantly. I shall miss him more than most other men will. His advice when I consulted him was always sound, and I know no instance in which I did not immediately follow it, and find afterwards that I had done right in following it. His perception of the real essence of every question that he had to determine, or share in determining, was instantaneous, and never mistaken. Among the bishops of many generations, there are very few that could be put by his side. And he possessed that crowning proof of superiority, that he was still growing in both intellectual and practical power, and year after year was greater than he had been before.'

LETTERS 1900

About a new church in Leicester planned when the Bishop was at Peterborough.

To the Rev. W. P. Holmes (Leicester)

‘ Fulham Palace, S.W. : December 14, 1899.

‘ There is no doubt (1) that English art in the middle ages disliked an apsidal end ; they got rid of them when they could.

‘ (2) That what we call altar cloths are peculiarly English. From these two principles it may be inferred that, if you have a basilica (which was not English), you are free from altar cloths (which are English).

‘ I think that you would do well if you had an altar designed. You could see one at St. Matthew’s, Northampton.

‘ But I advise that the structure be of wood : with a front in three compartments. It is a question how these compartments are best filled with panels . . the design may be as elaborate as you please ; the structure may be carved anyhow. But inside this may be placed panels, of needle-work, of carved wood, painted on a gold background, of copper, or brass, or silver gilt, or anything you like.

‘ You might have various sets in time : but they should be detachable, and not part of the structure.’

‘ London House : March 31, 1900.

‘ My dear Mr. Holmes,—I feel some difficulty as an amateur in criticising the work of a professional. . . . Let me state some general principles which occur to me. Modern architects seem to me rarely to face the question, What is a reredos ? They regard it as something in itself—to be considered as an ornamental appendage to the altar. Really it ought to be considered as the means of fitting the altar into the architecture of the east end of the church. Its function is to dovetail the two harmoniously into one. The altar itself can bear no relation to the size of the church, because it is conditioned by the limitations of human stature. Its height is given : and its breadth must bear a proportion to its height. The reredos is a means of getting over that limitation. Beginning as a decoration over the altar, it fits it into the general scheme of the architecture.

‘ In an apsidal church this consideration becomes prominent. If the altar is to stand close to the wall, I think you need so much structure as fits it in at the back and the sides, and admits of a continuous decoration extending to the walls on all sides. If the altar stands clear, there are two possible ways : (1) a baldachino, or architectural canopy ; (2) an open

screen going across the apse, but revealing it, and arranged to make a back for the altar, which may be as rich as possible, but aims at no architectural, only a decorative, effect. There is a third plan tried in St. Paul's Cathedral, which I cannot approve, of erecting a second apse within the first, with only a slight curve. This seems to me an architectural heresy.

'Now if I apply these principles to the design which you send me, I seem to find that it is conceived simply as an extension of the altar upwards, without any lateral adjustment to the rest of the church. In fact, the altar is treated as a sideboard, standing loose, with a carved back. As such, the design is very good. But is that the right conception?

'Again, there is the question, How far should the furniture of the church be conceived in reference to the general style of the architecture? I am not a purist on this point: I think you may design your furniture as you like. But this design is in the style of Wren's Renaissance. It is very good for that. But you have no examples in your neighbourhood. I confess I should prefer an earlier style.

'You will forgive these fragmentary remarks, and make such use of them as you think fit. . . .'

To Miss Constance Barrett

' Fulham Palace: January 8, 1900.

'Your reflection on character is very interesting to me. You are quite right. An old divine, Whichcote, puts the matter pointedly, "Heaven is first a *temper* and then a *place*."

'The *place* is the *temper*. "The kingdom of Heaven is within." You would find Church's book on the discipline of the Christian character very helpful. As I remember it (it is quite short) it begins with Abraham. We forget the significance of the beginning of religious history in him. Isaiah shows its importance: "the hole of the pit from which you were digged," "*alone* He took him." It was the beginning of individual character. Then Church considers the addition made to character by the law of Moses, by the Psalmists and Prophets: its expansion in the manifestation of Christ, and the results wrought since by the Christlike temper.

'You would find the line of thought very valuable for teaching.

To Mr. A. Devine

' Fulham Palace: January 9, 1900.

'My dear Sir,—I am much obliged to you for your paper. The teaching of history is difficult at school, and its value entirely depends on the grasp of the teachers. Examination in a text-book is of no avail: the pupil must get a sense of

social development before he understands history at all. This can only be done by comparison. French history is excellent for that purpose. Its process is more logical than ours. We progressed by muddling and waiting: the French were always solving questions and solving them wrong.'

To the Rev. T. W. Drury (Principal of Ridley Hall, Cambridge)

' Fulham Palace: January 18, 1900.

' Dear Mr. Drury,—. . . I did not expect my education remarks to be reported. I was speaking to a small gathering of heads and assistants of training colleges. I tried to get them out of conventional lines. This is only possible in a somewhat humorous vein. But I feel the great difficulty of inducing anybody to think freely for themselves. We *must* begin to *think* more, and get out of our self-complacency and our small area of view. Surely we are being bidden to amend our ways. Let us try and do so all round.'

To G. H.

' January 17, 1900.

' Why try for an occupation before it is necessary? I really think that matrimony is the best profession. Its advantages grow on you: the advantages of other things diminish. I wish I could help you more about all these things, but it is dreadfully hard to advise anyone by letter. Things read so hard and so snippy and so cold. But the only use of advice is that you should make the most of it, and that it should serve to set you on thinking for yourself. Whatever you decide must be decided by yourself at the end. The only thing is to make up one's mind and stick to it. Happiness in life consists in doing what one deliberately has chosen, because one's pleasure in doing it is apart from the results of doing it. This is complicated, but you will see what I mean if you think over it.'

To Mr. W. S. Lilly

' London House: February 3, 1900.

' Dear Lilly,—Thank you very much for your book,¹ which I have read with much interest and profit. It is hard work to get the public to consider any principles: but surely our parliamentary system is breaking down. People in general are ceasing to be interested in the way in which the party game is played. The present debate is a preposterous instance. The thing is becoming antiquated. Yet we do not face the fact. Will the shaking we are now undergoing make

¹ *First Principles in Politics.*

us any wiser? France grew no wiser from disaster. I think, however, that we are quietly growing in receptivity.

'There is a subject which I wish you would tackle—the mischief done by the crude transference of the evolution hypothesis to the conduct of human affairs. Because we have assumed a formula which explains some things, we seem to think that we have a method which will work by itself. Consequently individualism has no restraint: it believes that it will be kept right by the survival of the fittest. It does not consider what that process involves.'

'London House: February 14, 1900.'

'Dear Lilly,—Thank you for your letter in this morning's "Times." I am just correcting a proof in which I wrote that virtue was "a mean state between excess and defect." It comes to me "between success and defeat." So greatly has recent military experience affected the mind of the compositor, so entirely is he prepared to claim supreme excellence for whatever England does.'

To Professor Gwatkin

'London House: February 14, 1900.'

'Dear Gwatkin,—Many thanks for your "Chapters." They are admirable and breathe that lofty spirit which a patient study of history tends to engender. I saw in Archbishop Benson's life a passage in which he repeats a remark of the Queen. "As I grow older I am more and more astonished at the littleness of so many people."¹ It is sadly true. How is one to get the practical Briton to grow into larger views? Well, I suppose, we must keep on trying. But the joy of indulging in a fray about ever so small a matter seems to be invincible.

'I hope you are prospering. I am too busy to prosper.'

To Mr. William Buckler (Baltimore)

'London House: February 16, 1900.'

'My dear Buckler,—I am very much obliged to you for the sermon of Bishop King which Beatrice has brought me. The autograph in the beautiful Elizabethan hand is very interesting. King's portrait hangs in the dining-room at Fulham. It is the best of the series, and is by Cornelius Jansen. Hence King is more real to me than any of his successors.

¹ The Bishop quotes from memory. The Queen's words, as recorded by Archbishop Benson, were: 'As I get older, I cannot understand the world. I cannot comprehend its littlenesses.' *Life of Archbishop Benson*, vol. ii. p. 11.

'Beatrice enjoyed her time in the States very much. . . . The only disappointment she endured was that she could see so little of Georgie. She must really give her great mind to the duty of recovery, and pursue it steadfastly in the spirit of obedience to orders. I always hold that when one is ill the only duty is to get better, and to this everything else has to give way. . . .

'England has not been very cheerful lately. We are having the conceit taken out of us, and take the process rather soberly. But I am convinced that it will do us a great deal of good. We have much to learn. We are indolent, careless of ideas, too little sympathetic with other people, trusting too much to our practical capacity, and not developing our intelligence sufficiently. It is a good thing for us to be stirred up and made to feel that we cannot have everything just for the asking.'

To one who, as a father of five boys and a parish priest, wrote to ask him whether he considered that a young man could best be helped to lead a pure life by confession

'London House : March 6, 1900.

'My dear Sir,—I am interested in your letter. You have touched the point. Confession is meant to be the means of relieving a troubled conscience : it is being used as the means of awakening a dulled conscience, which it then proceeds to relieve in an unintelligent way. Advice, and warning, even at regular intervals, can be given to the young without the formal apparatus of confession.

'I think, however, that a boy's father ought to do much more for him than he does.'

To a young friend

'March 13, 1900.

'Crises may come in life, difficulties, trials—how are you to face them if the thought which is forced upon you is "I married this man for no reason, except that he asked me, and nobody else did." Of course everybody has to reduce their ideal to terms of what is real : but this is done not by abolishing your ideal and taking the real instead, but by clothing the real with your ideal. You can always in anyone see much to admire ; you can put yourself in touch with this, and see all the good, and feel it strike response in you, and gradually lead further into mysteries of another's life. But ——— craves for affection as a drunkard does for drink, and may take it because it is given, and then feel the usual headache and be sorry. One never knows what is best for another, or how things may shape themselves. But one must press that they

should be decided in a reasonable way, and not be slipped into.'

To Mr. H. Oelsner

'London House: March 17, 1900.

'My dear Sir,—I am very much obliged to you for your book on "Dante and Modern Thought." As you truly say, "Dante can never be popular" because so much knowledge is required to understand him with any completeness—knowledge moreover of an obscure kind, generally sought for that reason only. This makes his influence the more remarkable. It is partly the influence of a powerful personality, partly that of a complete point of view over the world. Dante expresses what must ever be the most stimulating conception that can be offered to the mind—the sense of human power to gain a consistent grasp over the whole of things.

'This I think is the secret of his abiding influence.'

To G. H.

'March 31, 1900.

We all of us have our difficulties before we settle down in life. It is a tedious process sometimes to know what one wants, and then to consider how one is to get it. People generally think about the first without considering the second: or rather they are not willing to do what their first decision requires they should do. Life is one thing, the occupation one pursues is another. Music is an occupation which does not and cannot fill life. One sings sometimes and thinks about music. But life consists of one's relations to other people, and music does not make them, or teach one how to keep them. One can never do good to others, in the sense that they will do what one wants or become all that one would make them. But in dealing with them one's own self grows, new things are made manifest to one's eyes, new possibilities come into view. Religion does not by itself give anyone an interest in life. Religion may be as selfish as anything else. But it tells one the meaning of life, explains one's interests, shows what is true and real in them. Girls at the present day are curious creatures. They have obtained too much freedom all at once. They do not know what they want or how to get it. I quite agree with you that everyone must settle their own problems; you must set to work and settle yours. I think you will do it all right if you set about it in a right way.'

To Mrs. T. H. Ward

'London House: April 3, 1900

'My dear Mary,—If I did not sign the enclosed it would not be from any want of regard to Dr. Martineau, but from

a regard to the space in Westminster Abbey. I think that we of this generation are carrying commemorations so much further than our predecessors that we are losing all sense of standard. Supposing that Martineau had been an Anglican layman, I do not think that I could have supported him for Westminster Abbey. The only person whom I have supported is Ruskin.

‘The question in my mind is simply one of literary rank and permanent value of work. Unfortunately work in religious thought is of great value immediately, but of slight value in the future. I doubt if I should ever consider it of Westminster Abbey rank. It is addressed to its own generation. It has not the advantage of literary style or method, which give an abiding place to poetry or romance. It is part of the work to be done in each generation, and is consumed at once. It is not even like scientific work, the beginning of something new.

‘Such are my views, founded largely on the fact, that space in the Abbey will soon be non-existent. You will forgive me. . . .’

To Dr. Guinness Rogers

‘London House : May 22, 1900.

‘My dear Dr. Guinness Rogers,—I am very glad to receive your letter. To me it is the most painful proof of our inadequate hold on the principles of Christianity that the profession of those principles should be a cause of disunion and bitter feeling. Attempts to remedy this fail because they conceive *unity* as something external and structural. When we look at the development of the world, we see increasingly varied opinions kept within useful limits by a general sense of the common welfare. I can conceive of a Christian commonwealth, consisting of bodies of believers each with opinions of their own about matters of organisation, understanding one another, and respecting one another, yet conscious of a common purpose, which transcends all human methods.

‘An Italian friend of mine quoted in a letter a saying of a Greek Bishop—that our systems were necessary protections against the storms of the world, but though the walls might be thick below, they all opened to the same heaven.

‘I wonder if you have seen an interesting book with no author’s name, which was sent me by the publisher (Macmillan) a few days ago. It is called “Pro Christo et Ecclesia.” It is quite a short book, overstated, but containing food for reflection.’

To the Rev. W. J. Hocking

‘London House, 32 St. James’ Square, S.W. : May 22, 1900.

‘Dear Mr. Hocking,—Thank you very much for your kind proposal to pass on to me a curious relic connected with the Russian Church. The “Old Believers” are the Russian dissenters—only in that topsy-turvy country they are the more conservative party. Church and State are so intimately connected in Russia that it is a great difficulty how to deal with dissenters. They are allowed to have certain churches, but not to celebrate in them the Holy Communion. For that purpose they must attend the Orthodox churches. As a sign of this, the doors leading to their chancels are locked and sealed. Their great desire is to have the seals removed. For this they approach the Emperor with petitions on occasions when such petitions are presented.

‘The Easter egg which you possess must have been one of the offerings which accompanied such a petition ; it could with propriety be sent to the Emperor at Easter.

‘The study of Russian dissent is very curious. To it the Emperor—Peter the Great—and his reformers represent Antichrist. It lives entirely in the unreformed past. Yet we in England glibly prescribe for this conservative people more reforms made from above.’

To Miss Alice Gardner

‘London House : Ascension Day, 1900.

‘Dear Miss Gardner,—Thank you very much for your book on “John the Scot.” I am glad that you are interested in mediæval thought. Certainly John is little known or reckoned with. I hope you may stir up some interest in him. I read a good deal of the book on Sunday, and was glad to go back to paths which I had forsaken.

‘The toil of endeavouring to get any ideas into people’s heads nowadays is vast. It is a refreshment to contemplate ideas in the making.

‘I hoped that history would flourish at Cambridge. I think that now there is a vast increase of popular interest in the subject, and that popular treatment by a competent hand is welcomed.’

To Miss Ella Pease

‘July 23, 1900.

‘Thank you very much for the Masolino photographs¹ They are charming, and have all the Giottesque power of telling a story. They fit in with the two series of Benozzo Gozzoli at San Gimignano and Montefalco, where he painted

¹ Of the frescoes at Castiglione di Olona.

the lives of St. Augustine and St. Francis; but Masolino is inferior to Giotto in composition. Art always proceeds in the same way. There is a great master who conceives things as a whole. Then come men who elaborate details. So Masolino is interested in details of the human form. His Baptism shows a desire for accuracy of attitude in separate figures, to which he sacrifices the general effect. This is his merit. He was a pioneer of Signorelli, who brought together again the knowledge which Masolino and others laboriously followed in details. . . . Thank you very much for bringing back my memories of that charming and little known place.'

To Mrs. T. H. Ward (about 'Eleanor')

' . . . I think your problem is immensely difficult. Neither of your two chief characters is obvious or attractive. They are common enough, no doubt; but they are difficult to represent so that anyone is interested in them: they seem out of the range of strong sympathy. But those who see the problem will appreciate the way in which it is handled.'

' July 26, 1900.

' Dear Mary,—I did not mean to say that I was not drawn to "Eleanor;" but I wondered if the general public would feel a great interest in her. They would enjoy the Italian life, and the clerical side, but I wonder if they will feel the supreme interest of the *dénouement* as you have worked it out. But I dare say I am quite wrong. I have left off attempting to gauge the possibilities of public appreciation of anything. I frankly confess that it is beyond me.

' I admit that the world is full of predestined failures: and that failures in the life of the affections are among the most common, and at the same time the saddest. You have worked this out, and have shown the way of self-abnegation. But I wonder if the general mind will grasp it in the sense in which you meant it. I hope they may. I think Americans would be more perceptive than English on such a point, but again I do not know. You know so much better than I do. I should never have ventured to work out such a problem with so many accessories. But then I am deficient in audacity. I personally feel that Manisty was not worth it, and that Eleanor was worth a regiment of American girls; and I feel a burning desire to explain to them that they are all wrong—that Lucy will bore Manisty after marriage, that there is no real companionship between them, and that Eleanor had better write his book for him, and be happy in so

doing. You see that I am interested to the point of personal feeling on the matter.

'I know now what I forgot to ask you the other night. Have you read "Pro Christo et Ecclesia"? It is written by a woman. It has obvious faults, crudity, repetition, exaggeration, but it has real thought in it.'

To Mr. A. E. Pease

'The Tower, Portinscale : August 14, 1900.

'Dear Alfred,—I shall be delighted to read your book¹ when I can get it. Meanwhile accept my thanks for sending it me. . . . I am very glad that you have written it. Family records are of great value, and the history of a family affords materials for understanding the forces at work in society. I have often thought that the history of England ought to be written in that form for various epochs. It would tell you more that is worth knowing than any other way.'

'Fulham Palace : September 17, 1900.

'My dear Alfred,—I have come home and have unearthed your book from a clothes basket filled with varied literature. I have read it with the greatest interest, and am very much obliged to you for thinking of sending me a copy. I think that what you have written is as impressive from its reserve as from what is said. Lessons of the inner meaning of life are learned in various ways, but every man must hold dear the way in which he himself learned. As he looks back upon his course through life, he can appreciate the cumulative power of what may seem trifles—of what he regarded as trifles at one time. Perhaps now we should all of us (you and I are not so different in age that we may not stand together) value highest those influences which made for *discipline*. Is it not again disappearing? Does it not need renewing? The system of the Society of Friends maintained its necessity and kept it alive. We cannot do without it. It is perhaps our chiefest national need. Forgive my moralising, and accept my thanks.'

To the Rev. J. P. Gledstone

'Fulham Palace, S.W. : October 8, 1900.

'My dear Mr. Gledstone,—Thank you very much for your Life of Whitefield, which I have been reading with interest. You put before your readers the secret of the man's power and influence. It is curious to notice at the present day the change of popular taste. It is not now eloquence but common sense, which is listened to. When Whitefield

¹ *Ex Umbris*. Twenty-five copies only printed for private circulation.

appeared utterance was rare, now it is one of the commonest of things, and I am sometimes tempted to regret that all means of appeal have become vulgarised by their constant and habitual use. What strikes me about Whitefield is that his sermons were appreciated by the highest and the lowest; that again is scarcely possible at present. I feel that what is most necessary in preaching at present is to show the power of the Gospel not only to the individual, but to the whole current of social and political life. I sincerely hope and pray that your book may move the hearts of many. Thank you for your kind expressions toward myself. I am glad to think that we are fellow-borderers. I walked through Haltwhistle in August in the pouring rain, being washed down there from the Roman Wall.'

To the Rev. Prebendary Eardley-Wilmot

'Fulham Palace, S.W. : November 3, 1900.

'Dear Prebendary Eardley-Wilmot,—It always has seemed to me one of the most difficult of a clergyman's duties to decide about the limits of his activity and the sphere of his work. I think that they must differ from time to time, and must stand in relation, partly to the needs of society, partly to the position in which he finds himself placed.

'I have tried to think the matter out with reference to these considerations: and I think that at the present time a clergyman can do most useful work on the School Board, especially a clergyman such as you are. You will understand me when I express some dread at the development of (1) what I will call the *secularised* clergyman and (2) the *business man* clergyman. Frankly if you either were, or were likely to become, either of these, I should dissuade you. But then, if either alternative were probable, you would not have asked my advice.

'But if I may advise you, not only on general grounds, but from my knowledge of yourself, I should say—Put yourself at the disposal of the public in this capacity. You are not a partisan; you are not wedded to your own opinions; your temper as well as your capacity would make you a valuable member of the Board. So I say if the call comes to you, listen to it, and let the election decide if it be God's will that you should serve Him in that way.'

To the Rev. Canon MacColl

'Fulham Palace : October 1900.

'My dear Canon MacColl,—Thank you very much for your book and for your interesting letter. I quite agree with you about the desirability of a good understanding between

us and the orthodox Church both on religious and political grounds, but my own endeavours in that direction have shown me quite clearly that this cannot be accomplished from above, but must proceed from below. I mean by this that it can only be brought about if the *people* on both sides wish it.

‘Now the very attempts of superior persons on both sides to promote this result tend to create suspicion amongst the people. I think that we in England especially have gone quite a wrong way to promote union of churches. We have attempted to say, “The Church of England really holds and does all that you do.” We have then tried to get half a dozen churches run on lines of which this would be true. We have then taken foreign ecclesiastics to these churches with triumph. But this has deceived nobody, and has helped nothing. It would help us much more with the Eastern Church if we said : “The English people had suffered so much from the Pope that they were determined to forget him and his ways. The result was that they dropped out of their services some things which you have—not because they objected to them in themselves, but because they reminded them of the Pope and his false teaching. This is rather interesting historically and the English people are still proud of it, and look with grave suspicion on any attempts to add ceremonies which they think resemble popery.”

‘I have no doubt in my own mind that this is the attitude which will carry more conviction than any other. To put the same thing from the political point of view. We English are hopelessly insular. It is no good attempting a *rapprochement* with any continental people on the ground that we are animated by a strong cosmopolitan spirit. You and I may regret our excessive insularity, but if we are to make way practically, we must frankly admit it, and then try to make the best of it. Any attempt to deny it, or to minimise it, only creates a popular outburst which sweeps all before it. To go back to matters ecclesiastical. The Archbishop’s decisions have said no more than I have indicated. Anyone who believes that incense and reservation are tests of Catholicity will not be satisfied by the fact that after three centuries of disuse they are recognised as barely possible in the Church of England, but are so distasteful to the great mass of its members that they are never likely to be used except in a few churches, very carefully prepared for the purpose.

‘These are my views. I give them to you for what they are worth,’

To Mrs. T. H. Ward

‘ Fulham Palace : November 14, 1900.

‘ My dear Mary,—You will be feeling deep sorrow at the loss of your father, and I would like to write a word of sympathy. Old age, long expectation of loss, all such things do not really lessen the sorrow when it comes. For there is the revival of many memories and the feeling of a breach with the past that is irreparable.

‘ I knew your father and appreciated him since I first knew him at Lynton. He was always to me a type of the character which above all aimed at sincerity, and asked nothing from the world save liberty to live up to what he held most true. It is a hard task, easy at it seems—perhaps the hardest any-one can undertake.

‘ I remember that I asked him to write a little volume on “Modern England” in a series of school books. He undertook the book at first, and then wrote to me and begged off, saying that he felt he ought to sing the praises of modern civilisation, but he positively could not. So it was with him always : so he showed himself in his “Reminiscences”—not seeking the prizes which are to be gained only by those who throw themselves into what is, without a thought of what might be.

‘ He was one of those very rare characters who was determined “to keep himself unspotted from the world.” Surely nothing is more precious when we look at it fairly than the life of the student, the scholar, the thinker, whose chief aim is to be true to the best he knows. Such was your father, and all who knew him will ever feel that they were better for that knowledge. It is presumptuous of me to write this to you : but I write it as it comes, in deep sympathy and with much affection.

CHAPTER XIV

CHARACTERISTICS AND SAYINGS¹

THOSE who had known him long, all agree in saying that the Bishop was one who changed singularly little. The Merton undergraduate was in all essentials the same man as the Bishop of London. He grew and developed, but the fundamental character was unchanged, and 'that foundation was given him by the north country and was very grave and sedate.'² In spite of all his brightness and his humour, of his warm affectionate ways, he was in truth very stern, grim he called it—stern with himself, and stern with those for whom he felt any responsibility.

Even in outward appearance he had changed but little. From very early days he wore a beard, reddish at first, which grew grizzled during the last ten years of his life. But his thick fair hair disappeared early, and he became very bald. He was always thin and spare, but his wiry active frame and firm step told of strength and vigour. His height was 5 ft. 11 in., and he held himself well; his hands and feet were exceptionally well shaped. Since his schoolboy days his blue-grey eyes had looked out through gold-rimmed spectacles, which were, however, unable to veil their tender searching expression, or the rapid flash of humorous appreciation with which he would suddenly look up. He was fond of telling how, after he had on account of his extreme short sight early taken to spectacles without first consulting an oculist, he was once dining in London, when a perfect stranger, who had sat opposite to him, came up after dinner, and said: 'Excuse me, but may I look at your eyes?' The stranger

¹ For obvious reasons I have tried as far as possible in this chapter to use the words of others. These are, as a rule, designated by quotation marks, and in many cases with the name of the writer.

² Dr. Bigg.

turned out to be a distinguished German oculist, who told him that the glasses he was wearing were quite wrong, and would soon lead to the loss of power in one of his eyes. A professional visit followed, and glasses were prescribed which he wore all his life. His eyes were very strong, though he was always careful to read in a good light, but he could read all day in the train without fatigue. He never removed his glasses, except in bed, and would peer over them to read a particularly small print, saying that his eyes were as good as magnifying glasses. 'The most remarkable feature of his face, without doubt, was his curious mouth, sensitive and mobile, yet constantly closing with a snap in the act of will. Nothing was more notable and pleasing than the way in which his severe keen face, braced by the aquiline nose to a disciplinarian austerity, lightened up and softened with this incessantly recurrent smile.'¹ His habitual expression was one 'of concentrated energy,' but it could change in a moment to unrestrained gaiety and amusement. In public, his bearing was simple and dignified; he used little gesture in speaking. He was always careful of his dress and appearance; F. C. G. often caricatured him, but never quite caught his likeness; once he drew him as the episcopal stork, 'who is graceful and elegant and steps delicately.' In private, he was fond of the strangest attitudes. Lying on the floor was his favourite position, and he would twist himself into the most wonderful contortions. He was at his ease under all circumstances, for he did not know what shyness meant, and was absolutely free from self-consciousness. There was not the least suggestion of any air of superiority about him, and he never talked down to people, or knew what it was to pose. This was not merely an outward manner, it was the expression of character; he did not believe that his gifts were anything remarkable, and honestly thought that he could learn from everybody. There was nothing that he was more severe upon in those nearest to him than any appearance of what he called superiority. If anyone uttered a judgment with a tinge of contempt or self-sufficiency in it, he would invariably say, 'Don't be so superior.'

'He would suffer fools gladly, as many of us clergy know by what is now a bitter experience. Whatever he may have

¹ Edmund Gosse, *The Atlantic Monthly Mag.*, May 1901.

thought in his heart of our ignorance, narrowness, and self-sufficiency, his simple courtesy never failed him.'¹ 'He had an extraordinary faculty of talking to men, and especially young men, in such a way as to make them feel that he really set some value by what they said.'² The same quality appeared in all his intercourse with others even when he was a bishop. He wrote to his officials as a fellow-worker, asked their advice, made remarks of a kind to put them in a good humour, and gave them his full confidence. As he was neither shy nor condescending, people readily felt at their ease with him and children made friends with him directly. Once at a Fulham garden party, a little girl absolutely refused to go till she had spoken to him. This child had amused herself at home by scribbling on scraps of paper, and saying that she was writing letters to the Bishop of London. Her father, on bringing her up, said, 'My little girl is most anxious to speak to the Bishop of London, to whom she is always writing.' The Bishop lifted her up, kissed her, and held her in his arms whilst he said, 'I have not had your letters.' When he understood how it was, he said, 'When you can write, mind your first letter is to be to the Bishop of London.' The next year the child came again to the garden party, and, watching her opportunity, ran straight across the lawn to the Bishop. Seeing her coming, he stretched out his arms for her to run into, took her up, and put her on his shoulder, and then, as she afterwards told her father, asked whether she would like to sit on the top of his hat.

Animals came to him as readily as children, and he loved them, though, except for a cat in his college days, he never actually had a pet of his own. But he would play with a dog as if it were a baby; and whenever he met a dog on his walks, he went up and spoke to it, however ferociously it was barking, and nearly always succeeded in turning its anger into friendliness. Birds were a special delight to him. In Embleton days he paid much attention to a white rook from the rookery, which had been tamed in the garden, and to a hawk which for a while consented to stay with us, and used to sit on the back of his chair; and he loved to watch the birds that gathered on the lawn to be fed.

¹ Dr. Cobb.

² Mr. J. Adam, Fellow of Emmanuel.

In his later years it was a trouble to him that he could not get quite young men, his sons' undergraduate friends, to talk freely to him. This was all the more disappointing because all his life he had had to do with young men, and had got on exceptionally well with them. It used to call forth some very severe remarks on the modern undergraduate. 'In my time at Oxford, if any distinguished man came to visit the University, we would want to talk to him, or rather hear him talk; but nowadays the undergraduate seems to spend his days in trying to avoid talking to anyone wiser or older than himself.' When it was urged that it was only shyness, he answered, 'Perhaps, but shyness is only conceit.'

'He had not a shred of pride or pomposity. I never saw him irritated, or put out, or brusque, or grumpy. Once or twice I have heard him speak very sternly, but I never saw him ruffled, embarrassed, or peevish.'¹

His greatest sternness, as well as his deepest tenderness, was reserved for those nearest him. They alone seemed to have the power to provoke him to sharp words, because to them he applied the same high standard which he applied to himself. It was part of his training of his children that they should know that there was someone who could be irritated by carelessness, noise, and things which often seemed to them mere trifles; he said that it was a check to the prevalent tendency to arrogance. Once he said to one of his boys, after reproving him for some small piece of idiocy, 'I think you will allow that when I am nasty, few people can be nastier,' and when his son agreed, he went on, 'It is good for you to know that there is someone whom you can't annoy without being made to feel it. I dare say you often think me unfair, but it doesn't matter; it is good for your arrogance to meet someone you can't annoy with impunity.' He hated faults of inconsiderateness, carelessness, and general slovenliness. He objected to needless running in and out of rooms, and if a child burst aimlessly into his study and said as an excuse, 'Is mother here?' he would look up and ask: 'Has the cook fallen into the fire? for if she hasn't you needn't hunt for mother.' No trifle escaped him, and his reproofs were always original. If his children put their fingers into their

¹ Dr. Bigg.

mouths, he would remark, 'Your mouth is not a glove ; your tongue is not a piece of soap.'

'But if he had to reprove for a serious fault his manner was quite different ; he might be stern, but he was just, and his manner so kind and loving that he left only a sense of shame and a desire to make amends.' His children always felt that he trusted them, and expected the best of them, but he never wearied them with long serious talks, or overmuch advice ; a very few words were enough to convey his meaning. 'Your life is your own,' he once said to one of his sons ; 'if you want to make a fool of yourself, it's not my business. I can only give you advice ; you are at liberty to take it or ignore it. I am sure you will only do what is right, so what does it matter what my opinion is ?' His children sometimes thought that he was unduly severe to some people, and much too kind to others, but they came to see that his severity was due to his hatred of people not making the best of their gifts and themselves, and that he hoped to brace them to effort ; whilst, when people had few gifts and were comparatively helpless and useless, he felt that the best that he could do for them was to be sorry for them and love them. To his children he often said, 'You could not have a worse sort of father than me. The best thing I could do for you is to die as soon as possible, then there might be some chance for you. It is so difficult for you to realise that you are in an absolutely false position, and that, though I may be considered a great man, you are absolutely nothing, and have no position. I feel I ought to apologise.'

In family discussions he was very particular about the use of words, and would constantly pull people up with a request that they should define the word they were using. To some phrases he particularly objected. If, after he had spoken, one of his children said, 'I don't agree,' he would say, 'Who cares if you agree or not ? To say you don't is mere impertinence ; say what you think by all means, but don't tell me that you don't agree.' If anyone went on arguing in a futile way, he would say, 'Hit that fellow over the head with a spoon.' He disliked slipshod ways of talking, and the expression 'I am going *to*,' or 'I don't want *to*,' was particularly obnoxious to him, and was invariably answered with 'Do you

want three, then ?' When tired he was often silent in the family circle, but he always liked others to talk, and objected to the conversation sinking to details about family arrangements, which he described as 'dregs.' He did not like people to mutter to their neighbours at table, and have private jokes ; he wished the talk to be general. Letters were never allowed at breakfast time, and business was not to be protruded. He always enjoyed telling stories that he had heard, and had an inexhaustible store of his own. The worst riddles amused him, and he could talk nonsense endlessly, and enjoy jokes of every kind, bad and good. 'His humour was always gay and pleasant,' he set a high value on cheerfulness, and on the existence of a sense of leisure and repose in family life.

We often teased him for his exaggerated expressions in his descriptions of things and people he had seen. But though his opinions on them were often pronounced, and he enjoyed discussing people, he was never bitter, his judgments were always kindly. In earlier days his standard had been almost purely intellectual, but in later life simplicity and charm and genuine goodness seemed to appeal to him most. He said, 'The power of simple goodness is the greatest in the world.'

Often he told us the stories of the novels he had been reading, and discussed the problems they raised, and also plots for novels, which he had himself elaborated generally when lying awake at night. Love problems were of special interest to him. He wanted everybody to be married, thinking that only so could their characters be fully developed. He said that if a man only cared enough, he could get any girl to marry him, and that a girl, if she went about it the right way, could make a man propose to her. When he heard of a man who had been refused, he said, 'He has just to go on proposing at definite intervals, and she will accept him in the end.' Another time he said, 'No man ought ever to be refused ; he ought to know what the answer will be before he proposes ;' and again : 'The mistake that young people will make is to think that they can all be Romeos and Juliets—that is nonsense. Falling in love is a gift like anything else. People keep asking themselves, "Is

this the real thing?" instead of asking whether it is the best they are capable of.' He often spoke on this point in connexion with the appearance of the Browning Letters, and lingered one morning in the drawing-room at London House to discuss it for more than an hour with a friend and me. 'It is curious,' he said, 'though men and women are quite ready to admit that they are not great painters or great musicians or poets, they all assume that they are capable of being artists in love. When they read the Browning love letters, they assert that they must be unreal, because they themselves have not felt such things; but an artist in love is no commoner than any other artist.' He considered Dante's grasp of the theme of love to be without parallel in literature. Of himself a friend who had known him long and intimately said, 'No living man was more loving, or more deeply penetrated with a sense of the infinite power of love in human life.'

Once when one of his sons was sitting talking to him after dinner, and he seemed to be more absorbed in his own thoughts than in what was being said to him, he suddenly looked up and remarked, 'Have you ever thought that Othello was quite right in strangling Desdemona? She can't have been a nice girl, or she would never have eloped with a Moor. I wonder if anyone has ever acted it from that point of view.' He used to say that he would like to be employed by parents to break off undesirable engagements, that he could imagine many ways of getting young people to do of their own accord what they would not do on command.

He never wished to absorb the conversation, and he had 'the rare power of developing his own opinions without haranguing.' Wherever he was, whether in society or at a meeting, he was 'the ruling spirit, but he never dominated,' he was never aggressive or interfering. Into every subject he touched he threw a fresh interest and 'illustrated it from his wealth of knowledge.' It was always the subject which possessed him, never the effect he might produce. And this was perhaps one of the reasons why he was accused of flippancy. Though possessed of rare powers of sympathy, he was yet often quite unconscious of the effect his words might produce on the minds of others. He was playing with ideas, he did not remember that everyone did not understand

the game. 'He puzzled people.' He seemed to 'hide himself in paradox and playfulness,' and seldom to show his deeper side, so that there were those who doubted whether it existed. Some who, after they had known him for some time, at last discovered it, imagined that something new had developed it; they did not see that it had always been there, but that they had failed to discern it. Others at once saw through 'his apparent levity to his real and permanent seriousness.' His aversion to explain himself also helped to make him a lasting puzzle, especially to some of his unorthodox friends, who could not understand how a man of his mental qualities and temper 'could stand by historic and Catholic Christianity.'

In Cambridge, where people were apt to take themselves rather seriously, he was often considered flippant, because he was not what they considered a professor ought to be; just as at other times he puzzled, and sometimes shocked, people because he was not what they thought a clergyman or a bishop ought to be. He did not say the right thing, he was too often unexpected, or, as he put it himself, 'he was a child of nature.' 'The pity about him,' said one who knew him well, 'is that he is much too clever by nature. He does not know how clever he is, and does not see that the things he says are sometimes so clever that no one can understand. He never explains, and people don't like being mystified by another person's cleverness.' He used to say of himself: 'There is no man so incautious with his tongue and so cautious with his pen as I am.' His conversation struck some as 'very unguarded;' he liked 'to run tilt against established customs and prejudices.' But no one who ever saw in the least below the surface, or who sought his help or advice, thought him flippant for a moment. It was that very quality of unexpectedness which gave intercourse with him its special charm. He had 'the quality of attracting interest; he was never dull or left others dull, he made others interested in what he was interested in himself.' As one friend said, 'You sat down to hear what he had to say on a well-worn subject with a feeling of eager expectation, knowing that it would be something new.' And the same thing characterised him in the intimacy of private life. He was always fresh.

His point of view was never the commonplace or conventional one, and he was quick to criticise another's platitudes. Yet he had no desire to appear unconventional, and was punctilious about small social observances. 'Be conventional in small things, then you can be unconventional in large ones' was a favourite maxim of his.

His mental freshness and vigour was one of the reasons of the strong influence he exerted on those who came across him. One of his clergy writes :

'I used often to meet him, and he would sometimes ask, me to go a little way with him, with the result that I always saw something in a new light, and had my head full of ideas for a month . . . what always struck me as so wonderful was the way he understood one and saw what one was aiming at. It was not his intellectual equals that interested him exclusively, he was interested in ordinary people, in his own clergy too ; he thought them quite worth talking to, and he gave them of his best. I never knew anyone who was so mentally and morally stimulating.'

Very many said of him : 'I spoke to him only a few times, but he was the strongest influence in my life.' 'His freshness and the force and intensity of his nature enabled him to effect in two minutes what another might fail to do in two hours.' But this influence was not of the kind usually called personal influence ; on the contrary, 'he scrupulously avoided all attempt to use personal influence gained through the affections.' He never wanted people to think as he did merely because he thought so. He said once, 'There is no one amongst your acquaintance who less wishes you to accept any of his opinions as infallible than I.' His constant effort was to make people feel their own responsibility. When asked advice he seldom recommended a definite course ; he would point out considerations which might not have struck his questioner, and try to help him to see the matter in all its bearings, but would make him feel that the responsibility of the decision must be his. He described his method once in dealing with a very difficult case of a girl who was determined to defy the ordinary moral law. 'I was very impertinent and very apologetic. I tried to get inside her guard and not say the obvious things, to which she had answers cut and

dried.' The secret of his influence was said by many of his friends to arise from the fact that he made them feel at their best. 'He did more than reveal himself to us, he revealed us to ourselves.' He always seemed interested in the person to whom he was talking, and 'he knew how to encourage so as not to puff up with praise, but to give the feeling of responsibility which comes with the knowledge that a good and great man thinks one capable of doing good work.' But though, generally speaking, his influence may be described as bracing and stimulating, his tender sympathy was always ready when needed. 'There was no one like him if one had a sore trouble of one's own. He met you on your own ground and yet insensibly lifted you to his. He did this by his real personal sympathy, by his keen insight, and by his deep goodness.' 'His large clear-sighted vision seemed to see far away over other men's heads, and yet his sympathy was always ready for the smallest child.' 'Being with him makes me so much happier and the whole world and everything around seems so much broader and better and more beautiful, and full of infinite possibilities and realities.'

He never forgot old friends. 'I doubt,' said one of them, 'if there has ever been one whose brilliant gifts lifted him so high and yet who never forgot his lowliest friends, and never diminished his affection for them ;' and another, 'however great he became, he was always too great to forget those to whom he had been kind in days gone by.' Few things seem to have made so deep an impression on those who came across him as his kindness. One of his London suffragans says : 'One scarcely meets a clergyman who has not had individual dealings with him in his brief London episcopate, and over and over again, as we speak of our loss, the remark is made "He was so very kind to me, I can never forget it."' This kindness sprang from an ever-growing interest in, and love for, his fellow-creatures. In early Oxford days, his friendships had been strong and numerous, but had been confined to the men around him ; life at Embleton had enormously widened his sympathies. He said himself, 'I learned a great deal in Northumberland, learned to know something about human life as it really is—a subject which universities do not teach.' In his later years at Fulham he once raised the question, 'What is life given us

for?' None of the answers proposed satisfied him, though he agreed that there was much in the suggestion that 'life was an opportunity for service ;' finally he himself gave the answer, 'life is an opportunity for loving.'

His deep interest in character was both the cause and the effect of his historical studies. 'Dr. Hodgkin says, 'I have sometimes doubted whether, with all his great literary talent, his heart was really in literature. It seemed to me that human affairs, moulding the lives of others, and organising a parish or a diocese, was work which he really enjoyed more than writing a book. In other words, that he was essentially not a student, but a "shepherd of the people." ' 'His chief characteristic,' said Count Balzani, 'was that he was primarily a pastor of souls.' But anyone who watched him closely day by day could not fail to see that his first love was the life of a student. 'All I want is to read a book,' he said again and again. His capacity as an administrator was always interfering with the studies to which he longed to devote himself ; his practical powers, his gift for managing men and things, could not be suppressed. In leaving Embleton, he deliberately chose the life of the student. 'I had to reflect,' he wrote, 'whether others could not do administrative work as well, whether the Church at present did not need some students. It seems to me that, in the face of the possibilities of the future, a time may come when a clergyman with a knowledge of ecclesiastical history may be useful. I thought that nowadays there was plenty of zeal and plenty of practical capacity applied to the work of the Church ; on the other hand, I scarcely think there is enough learning.' He was profoundly convinced of the supreme value of knowledge, and considered that the ordinary tendency was to care much too little about it. He was fond of saying, 'The English boy begins with a rooted objection to knowledge ; he dislikes knowledge for its own sake ; he not only dislikes it, he despises it.'

When Dr. Stubbs was made a bishop in 1884 he wrote to him, 'I must say this, that for the sake of the Church I think it is the very best thing that has happened for many years. Frankly, I have been somewhat alarmed lately at the thought of the want of *wisdom* in the Bench. There is zeal, earnest-

ness, practical ability, eloquence enough, but wisdom? I think that your accession to the Bench will bring strength exactly where it is needed. Your large knowledge of everything concerned with the history, position, and principles of the Church will be of incalculable usefulness.' When a bishop himself he realised what his knowledge had done for him. During his last illness he was talking with his doctor about his work, and saying that, on the whole, he had not suffered much from the mental strain of it. He said, 'The accumulation of knowledge is drudgery, but acting upon knowledge and experience already gained requires no effort. As circumstances arise and present themselves to me, I make my decisions, and when they are made dismiss them.'

Dr. Randall Davidson (Archbishop of Canterbury) writes :

'Curiously enough—or perhaps it is not curious but characteristic—he took little part in our public debates while he was Bishop of Peterborough, although he regularly attended Convocation and served actively on more than one special committee. I believe that the only speech of importance which he delivered there during those five years was in May 1893, when quite briefly, but with his usual lucidity and force, he dealt with the subject of the fasting reception of Holy Communion, pointing out, in answer to the contention that the rule of compulsory fast had never been abrogated, how grave would be "the limitation of the practical power of the Church of England as an independent branch of the Catholic Church if we were to admit that the practice of the Church since the sixteenth century did not in itself establish an abrogation of customs which before that time had been in use." As Bishop of London he had of course to bear a larger share of the burden of debate, and his speeches used to strike me as possessing a forcefulness and grit which were unique. Even to prosaic "business" his pithy sentences could impart an unwonted vitality, and on some of the deeper questions he used to pierce with pungent force to the very root of the difficulty and set us all thinking afresh. This I think I can say with certainty, that every speech he made was pointed and original and suggestive, and that everybody listened for what he had to say.

'Often have I envied his power as he sat steadily writing his letters during the whole course of a debate, and yet was ready at a moment's notice, if the necessity arose, to make

a substantial contribution, as finished in outward form as it was solid in material.

‘Again, in a long experience of committees, I have never known any chairman with a power comparable to his of reducing the outcome of tedious and troublesome discussion into a few clear and cogent paragraphs in the form of a report. With him it used to be the work of a few minutes. On one memorable occasion in a large committee, where agreement had seemed to be hopeless, no sooner did the last speaker in the keen discussion sit down than the Bishop presented for our consideration a somewhat full report, every word of which he had drafted at the moment. It was unanimously adopted and has since been widely read. I remember Archbishop Temple saying to me, at the close of a Convocation week, “For sheer cleverness Creighton beats any man I know.”’

People were struck with the way in which ‘his knowledge was always available,’ ‘the rapidity of thought with which he could apply it,’ and ‘the swiftness of his decisions ; he saw at once all the salient points.’ Dr. Temple said of him ‘He seems to tear the heart out of a subject.’ He once said himself, ‘The mind that has been trained in any right method has gained power which can be applied to any object.’ His knowledge helped to give him ‘breadth of view and entire lack of prejudice ; he always saw both sides of a question, he could not be unfair.’ Most of all it helped him in forming judgments. ‘I have known no man who came nearer possessing “the right judgment in all things.” Is there a single instance of his having blundered or muddled things?’¹ It also ‘taught him to see things in proportion ; he had studied the controversies of the past too deeply to find those of the present all-engrossing.’

It was perhaps the fact that he did not feel that all the points in dispute were themselves of vast importance, that made him unsatisfactory to the extreme parties on either side in the ritual difficulties. He saw the importance of their effect upon the life of the Church, but many seemed to him comparative trifles. The mental attitude which led him to remark about incense, ‘My personal inclination is to say, if they like to make a smell, let them,’ was not likely to satisfy either side.

But though the tendency of his mind was to take wide

views, to get at the real issues of things, he did not despise details, and would take the greatest trouble to understand the small difficulties of a parish or an individual ; yet ' he was never buried under details, he himself was felt through all the routine of his work.'

No detail escaped his observation. Hearing some banns of marriage read out in an English church on the Continent led him to look into the question of the legality of English marriages abroad. His critical eye always fell upon public advertisements and notices in which he would point out errors of grammar or expression. He used to say that he would like to be appointed censor of all public notices in Europe. He did not grudge trouble given to small points, and liked all the appurtenances of his life to be appropriate and suitable. This made him anxious to have really fine episcopal seals. ' It is terrible how poor the modern seals are,' he wrote, and Mr. Harris Brown was commissioned to design his seals, which according to ancient custom bore the Bishop's image upon them. He was quick to notice dress, and whenever possible his daughters would consult him on the choice of their clothes, and he liked to choose himself the wedding presents for his friends. In lecturing he would often break off to develop some matter of detail which had struck him ; for instance, in a lecture on Church History he said ' that he was pained to see the clergy wear the foreign form of the college cap, the biretta, which was not at all English, neither was it ecclesiastical, but simply academic ; why should the English borrow a foreign form of an English hat ?'

In home life he noticed everything ; anything untidy or broken about the house or garden displeased him. He was critical too about his food, though never exacting. As a young man he had taken great trouble in the choice of his wine. He saw no need to condemn enjoyment of food and drink, which he considered as among God's gifts. In domestic matters he was never managing or interfering. He entirely trusted those who worked for him, and never interfered in the management of house or garden or stables, except by occasional criticisms. He never criticised other people's ways or opinions unless they interfered with his ; down to the minutest detail, he respected human liberty.

In his engagements he was exact without being a slave to punctuality. He insisted on the importance of not hurrying, and said that one should always be five minutes before the time for everything ; he spoke of the advantage of a clergyman being at his station five minutes before the train, as then he had a chance of talking to the porters and others. He said that, if he was a schoolmaster, he would not keep an undermaster who was constantly late for early school, and he once refused to accept a candidate for Ordination because his college testimonials said that he had never been able to get up for morning chapel. His own punctuality depended upon the importance of the occasion. He expected his carriage to be at the door punctually, and he would come when he thought right. What he cared most about was not getting fussed ; punctuality for its own sake was nothing to him. 'There can be no dinner till I come,' he would say if he were late for a dinner party. He was never fussy in getting ready for anything. Before a journey he might seem to put off his final preparations too long, but he was always ready without any scramble ; he never got into a fuss. In all our family history, one solitary occasion stood out when he had been fussed because he thought that a bag containing important papers had been left on the Worcester platform, when we started on our journey to Cambridge. 'Where's my black bag ?' became a favourite remark when his children wished to tease him.

He never worried, and if he grumbled his grumbling was quickly over. He once wrote : 'It is always good to get rid of anything that bores one. I like to have a swear at Louise or Percival when anything goes wrong, and then the air grows clearer. It helps one to pour sometimes.' But, as a rule, he kept his troubles to himself, and refreshed himself by talk about other things.

In travelling he never made difficulties, but submitted to extortions or neglect rather than make a disturbance. One thing, however, never failed to arouse his wrath, the extravagant demands of the porters who carried bags from the train to the Channel boats. He would load himself with his luggage rather than submit to them, and though he laughed at himself for his irritation, it returned on each occasion. He always liked to take care of himself and to find his own way,

and maintained that if he did give in and ask, he was always wrongly directed. If he was staying in an unknown neighbourhood, he did not wish to be told what walk to take, but preferred to explore for himself. He had an almost unerring instinct for finding his way, though he asserted that he did not know his right hand from his left, and could not remember whether the sun rose in the east or the west.

An indefatigable walker himself, he never realised that anybody else could get tired, and was rather intolerant with those who gave in to physical fatigue. He had a theory that everyone was tired at first on a walk, and that the only thing to do was to go on till you got over this first fatigue. In the spring of 1900, walking on a hot day in Italy with his son, he had decided to go up to see the view from the terrace in front of a chapel on the mountain. His son was tired and hot, and said he saw no point in going further, that the view was good enough where he was, and that he would wait there. The Bishop turned upon him, and said 'Do you think I am not tired? I have been ever since I started, but we said we were going to that chapel. I dare say the view may be no better, but what does that matter? It's exactly that lazy giving in that is ruining everything in England. You may say this is a small thing, but it is a type of the lack of energy of the young man of the present day. It is because an Englishman, when he said he would do a thing always did it, that we are where we are; but that quality is decaying now.'

His vitality struck everyone who saw him. It was said of him, 'he was one of the life-givers of the world;' and again: 'It was always an inspiration occasionally to hear him, and feel that he was directing things in this vast place.'¹ 'Very few men, however long lived, have effected so much as he did; the merest man in the street is feeling what a great vitality has gone out of the world.'² 'Some existences are a revelation of life, and his was one of those.'³ I do not know whether to call it the cause or the result of his vitality, but he seemed to live absolutely in the present. He seldom cared to talk about the past; his children could never get him to tell stories about his boyhood. He simply said, 'I was just

¹ Rev. Bernard Wilson.

² Mr. Bernard Bosanquet.

³ Count Balzani.

like any other boy.' The future interested him only in so far as he tried to discern what were the permanent results of current thought and events, or to ponder the question whether the greatness of England had reached its climax or not. But his main concern was with the present.

'He was often called versatile. I should say many-sided. Versatility seems to carry the notions of superficiality and levity, but he was not open to either of these suspicions. But certainly he combined a large number of really great gifts. He was amazingly facile, yet also extremely laborious.'¹ 'Day after day in London he has poured forth an unceasing flow of speeches on all manner of subjects with a facility of expression which can scarcely be matched. He has never repeated himself, he has never been commonplace, he has never failed to throw some light on the subject on which he has spoken.'² His readiness in speaking and preaching was remarkable. For instance, once at Worcester, on going into the Cathedral for service, he found that the special preacher for the day had not arrived; so he himself mounted the pulpit when the time came, and preached without any difficulty. He said that, once he had fixed upon a text, he was all right. This readiness was perhaps sometimes a snare, since it enabled him to preach without having given much time to special preparation. Some thought that his sermons occasionally gave the impression that they had not been well thought out before. He would get so interested in the earlier part that he left insufficient time for the application of his lesson, and he had a tendency to be too long for some people's taste. His friends amused themselves with testing his readiness. He was at Hutton Hall for the wedding of Sir Joseph Pease's daughter, and went with his host in the evening to a great banquet of servants and tenants. Without any warning, Sir Joseph, with a twinkle in his eye, at the end of his own speech called upon Mr. Creighton to speak, and he enjoyed telling afterwards 'how well Creighton had responded to this unexpected call.'

He worked quickly, and could readily turn his mind from one subject to another. 'No one preached more clearly by his action the value of intervals. In five minutes' waiting he would settle some matter, make some pregnant remark which

¹ Dr. Bigg.

² Dr. Chawner, Master of Emmanuel College.

would be food for thought and action long after. It was of course the celerity with which he worked, and the capacity he showed for turning his mind from one thing to another, that alone enabled him to get through the extraordinary amount of work which he did. As was once said, he had not only great talents, but had what nearly doubled them, the power of using all his gifts at any moment.' Perhaps in his later years he may have come to see that his powers were exceptional, as he could not help recognising the estimation in which he was held. But he genuinely believed that anyone could do the things he did if they only tried, and he was never anxious to push himself forward and be the one to do the thing which had to be done. One of his Embleton pupils writes: 'He had one most attractive virtue. He was entirely unworldly. I never knew anyone who was so little a respecter of persons or who laid himself out so little to impress those who might be useful. He had a great self-confidence, without any conceit, which was most impressive to youth.' 'At bishops' meetings he did not intervene very often. When he did, it was with a short, compact statement on the matter in hand, or on some principles involved in it. There was always a noticeable attention in the meeting when he rose, and what he said never failed to impress. Having said his say, he did not seem keen to debate upon it, and did not as a rule reply to criticisms. He seemed a little aloof from the meeting, and generally wrote pretty steadily through it—he seemed to know beforehand what each speaker was likely to say, but nothing escaped his attention.'¹ He was always able to attend to two things at once. He would sit in a room reading while others were talking, so absorbed, apparently, in his book that one almost forgot he was there, till he suddenly made a remark which showed that he had heard all that had been going on. In his last years he used always to rest his mind by reading novels in the drawing-room when at home in the evenings. All his life a novel-reader, he had as a young man mostly read French novels, and had very seldom cared for the current English novel. Afterwards he had been much interested by the great Russian novelists. Now he was ready to read almost anything, and it was difficult

¹ Dr. Talbot, Bishop of Rochester.

to keep him supplied. He seemed always able to extract something, some food for thought, some light on character or motive, from everything he read, even from a trashy novel. Analytic and introspective or problem novels he would never read. What he liked best was a good story of adventure. Anthony Hope he always enjoyed, and amongst the stories which pleased him most in his latter years were Mason's 'The Courtship of Morrice Buckler' and Halliwell Sutcliffe's 'Rycroft of Withens.' He also read Jokai with much enjoyment, and detective stories had a special fascination for him; he revelled in the adventures of Sherlock Holmes.

Of modern poetry he read little, except always with the keenest interest and appreciation the works of his old friend Mr. Robert Bridges. But he frequently turned to the older poets. He never went abroad without putting some little volumes of Shakespeare in his bag, and some book of poetry was always in his pocket on his long walks, to be read either to himself or aloud to his companion when he rested. In this way, on one of his last journeys to Italy, he read the whole of Milton's poems, and in talking about him to Mr. Herbert Paul afterwards, said that he found in them no proof of Milton having been an Arian. When he was taken ill in Italy he had Cowper with him, and one whole day, in bed and in much pain, he amused himself with 'The Task' and 'The Sofa.'

For serious reading he found little time during his London life, and yet he always knew everything about the books that were being read; a glance at their contents, a talk with someone who had read them, was quite enough for him. All his life he declaimed against the idea that it was necessary to read the books that were coming out. Speaking to some High School girls at a prize-giving, he implored them not to give way to the temptation to read the books that everyone else was reading; but at the same time he told them that books should be their greatest pleasure in life, and that anyone with a definite interest would always find time to read. To the last he never spent time over magazines, and no periodical except the 'Historical Review' was taken in by him. He read with absolute ease French, German and Italian books. Dr. Hodgkin recalls, 'He was reading some rather

stiff Italian book without a dictionary. I asked him why, and he said, "I make a point of never using a dictionary if I can help it." I look at the unknown word till I force it to tell me its meaning."

With his exceptional activity of mind and body, he needed a great deal of sleep. He loved his bed, and hated getting up. He said that bed was the one place where he was out of mischief. He liked at least eight hours in bed, and at intervals would give orders that he should not be called, and enjoy a long sleep. As a young man, when tired out at Oxford, he had sometimes gone up to London and taken a quiet bedroom at the top of an hotel so as to get an uninterrupted sleep. At times he suffered a good deal from sleeplessness, but he never took anything to make him sleep, and said that after a time he had learned that if you took it calmly, and did not fuss, lying awake did not matter much. He said to someone who was inclined to take a sleeping draught, 'It is better to do without sleep and be bored.'

He was without any luxurious tastes, and cared nothing for money or position for himself, though he was always careful for the dignity of his office. Once coming away from a great service at St. Paul's, when one of his boys wished to make a fifth in the carriage, he said, 'I don't want to be seen driving with a menagerie.' But away from his official position, no one could be more careless of appearances. He seldom entered a shop; but if he had to buy anything, whether for himself or for others, he liked to buy the best that could be got; he was quite ready to do without it, but if he got it at all it must be good.

He was particular about the things which were done for him without being exacting, and knew how to make it a pleasure to work for him, so that from his college days onwards he was always well served. He only had one curate, one domestic chaplain, one butler, and one coachman. He always got the best out of people simply by expecting it, as a matter of course.

His strength of character could not fail to impress everyone who met him. 'He was every inch a man.' 'He was the best of whips, with a light strong hand and a perfect temper.' 'He was absolutely fearless and self-reliant,' and

perfectly indifferent to criticism ; he never troubled to know what the press said about him. It was the truth he cared for, and, strong in his own opinions, he was always ready to listen to other people. The truth he was convinced would not be reached by controversy. ' I detest controversy, I want to speak the truth,' he said. He believed that no man could engage in controversy without becoming the worse for it. He defined it as ' the subtle temptation to fight the battle of the spirit with the weapons of the flesh.' He did not like the conception of life as a perpetual warfare, and thought the use of so many military metaphors in hymns and elsewhere was a mistake. The text ' He shall not strive nor cry nor shall his voice be heard in the street ' meant a great deal to him. One of his earliest sermons was preached on it, and it explains much of his life. He had nothing of a fanatic or even of an enthusiast in his composition ; his conception of the greatness of the truth was too intense for that. ' Men stretch forth their hands to grasp the truth,' he said, ' and think that the little they can grasp is the whole.' But the fact that he realised that there might be other ways of apprehending the truth than his did not make him less firm in his convictions. ' Of all men that I have ever met, he best united personal conviction with complete toleration.' He himself wrote once, ' It is so odd that so many people's hold of truth should be objective and exclusive. It seems to me the simplest thing to recognise the good in every kind of effort for Christ.'

He was essentially a peacemaker. ' It is noteworthy that never a word from his pen has been published but tended towards greater good-fellowship, or a more practical recognition of the brotherhood of races.'¹ And for himself what he always longed for most was peace and quiet.

In many ways no one was more absolutely independent of others and self-reliant than he. ' There is nothing in life except to enjoy what one is doing. It is the only secret of happiness,' he wrote in 1899. Three years before he had written, ' Relationships founded on a sense of lasting affection are the sole realities of life ;' and the affectionateness of his disposition showed itself constantly by word and look and deed. It might have seemed to the superficial observer that

¹ *Review of Reviews*, Feb. 1901.

he was very dependent on others. But he wrote again : ' After all, life is an individual thing. It is quite true that our lives are largely dependent on other lives. But what are we in our very self? I have a place in the world, a life to live, a work to do, independent of all outward things and of all other persons.'

When he heard of those who were utterly crushed and broken by the death of their dearest, and felt that life had lost all its meaning for them, he said that that was quite wrong ; the death of those we love should not crush us ; the fact that we have known and loved them, that love has revealed them to us, is the important, the permanent thing. As he wrote once, ' If you were to die to-morrow, I would still be eternally grateful for having seen you, still would live in your presence through my life.' It was characteristic of him that he seldom made arrangements or took trouble to see his friends unless they had any special need for him, though he always rejoiced when he did meet them. Otherwise he would say that it was enough for him to know that they existed.

In reality his life was built on two principles : one, the necessity of being something in oneself, of finding oneself, and having one's own existence, one's own life to live, apart from any other ties ; the other, the infinite importance of our relationships, as expressed in two favourite phrases : ' Life is the sum of our relationships,' ' Life is an opportunity for loving.'

This apparent contradiction is explained by the one permanent relationship which, to those who knew him, interpreted the meaning of his life, his relation to God ; as he said, ' In Christ all becomes plain. In my relationship towards Him all my other relationships find their meaning and their security.'

CONVERSATION

Of the nature of his conversation much has been said. Descriptions cannot recall it. I can only quote some of his sayings and opinions.

The following notes of a conversation on January 10,

1897, were written down by a friend immediately afterwards :

‘The great fault of the English is their insularity, and insistence on the English ideal as the only one possible. Hence comes our want of sympathy with those we govern, e.g. in India. The Russians, who understand Oriental ways, avoid this fault.’

‘We should consider what are the essential points in the Anglo-Saxon ideal, and be prepared to make concessions to Oriental ideas and thoughts, remembering that, as Kidd declares and Younghusband attests, the European supremacy is moral and *not* intellectual.’

‘England is the most artificial of states : a single disaster might crush us, as Athens was crushed. (Our coal cannot last for ever. France is *αὐτάρκης*, but she is perhaps the only European country that is.) Loss of commerce would ruin us as effectually as loss of men ruined Athens. So, again, would a single defeat at sea : hence the paramount importance of the navy.

‘But, if this is so, can we hope that such an artificial fabric will long escape a shock of some kind ? If it can do so for thirty years, it will be enough. By that time the colonies will have navies of their own, and England will gradually be able to retire. She will be the mother country to which the richest of her children will return to spend their money. There will be no great industries in England, but she will be the intellectual centre of a vast empire, radiating culture to its fullest limits. This was the dream of Athenian statesmen for their city : it is a view which I am endeavouring to impress upon the statesmen of my acquaintance. I hope I may succeed—but when I was asked to find a professor of history for Victoria I could get nobody to go !’

One who, on May 21, 1900, came to him very sad and perplexed, writes :

‘He saw that I needed a deep, far-reaching explanation of all the deepest things of life—life here and life beyond. He took me with him, as he talked, along strange and wonderful paths of thought, trying to teach me the great, large purposes of life—talking of nature’s laws, of the apparent sadness and cruelty of the world. He said that “if we went deeper, we could see a meaning, that nature’s laws work for the race, not for the individual. We cannot learn without suffering. Children hate going to school and doing their lessons ; they want to play. So it is with us. All our

lives we must go on learning. Afterwards, perhaps, we shall be, as it were, in classes. Those of whom we have made friends here (Make to yourselves friends of the Mammon of unrighteousness) will greet us, and be the first to talk with us afterwards. We shall perhaps say, 'You helped me awfully down there.' We shall still go on learning, only time and space, which belong to our lives here, and are part of our mental limitations, will be no longer. Here we see and know a few people clearly, and those whom we thus know are very dear to us; there we shall see and know everybody we meet far better than we know those whom now we know best on earth. And what more than all that? We cannot know."

'These are little bits of what he said. He seemed to carry me far away.'

He was fond of saying that 'things were really equal, that one man was as happy as another (i.e. in the circumstances of his life), that one man was as good as another, all were so infinitely far from the perfection of God that little differences did not matter.' Someone once said to him: 'How one wishes that it were just a little easier to do right!' His answer was: 'If it were a little easier we should still be so far from the perfection of God, that we should only wish it to be still a little easier.'

Having agreed once after much pressing to speak on some occasion, he was asked afterwards whether it was not a sufficiently interesting occasion to justify the pressure: 'Oh yes, my dear A——; but then they are all interesting occasions.'

At a prize-giving at Highgate he said: 'The days have long ceased when bishops could visit Highgate Woods for the purpose of hunting. I presume that they used to go there to hunt boars; nowadays bores hunt me, even in my own house.'

In an after-dinner speech; 'It is difficult to analyse the characteristics of the sub-species "prelates," whose habitats are sporadic, and of many of whom the habitats are the last places in which one is likely to find them.'

In a discussion about the universities he said 'The universities are a sort of lunatic asylum for keeping young men out of mischief.' Again: 'The universities are hospitals for the treatment of football accidents.'

The conversation at a London dinner party once turned on the use of national adjectives. 'Why,' said one, 'should

we talk of American humour or of German silver?' 'Or French leave?' said another. 'Or the nonconformist conscience?' said the Bishop.

To a clergyman who was doubting whether he ought to accept a living which the Bishop had offered him, he said, 'I think you ought to do what you are told; there is not enough obedience in this diocese.' The kind, half-joking way in which this was said made the clergyman at once reply, 'Very well, my Lord, if you say "Go," I shall do so.' He immediately rejoined, 'I say, emphatically, Go.'

Once after a somewhat trenchant remark of his someone said: 'Ah, Bishop, I am afraid you don't suffer fools gladly.' 'No, no,' answered the Bishop, rather gravely, and then added, with a sudden smile, 'But I *do* suffer them.'

Once overhearing a somewhat unorthodox person exhorting some clergy to leave off teaching the facts of religion and teach only the ideas which the facts represented, he turned round and said, 'But you forget, a fact when it is past becomes an idea.'

Speaking on the condition of the Liberal party: 'There is at present no great question of principle before the country calling for a manifestation of Liberalism. When such a question arises the Liberal party will become a power again.'

He constantly declaimed against our national conceit, and in the darkest days of the war he said, 'History has always shown that the Gods dislike and punish a conceited nation.'

SAYINGS

'No people do so much harm as those who go about doing good.'

'Nothing does good to others except what comes out of your own experience.'

'Take care of your temper and your work will take care of itself.'

'Salvation lies in the recognition of difficulties.'

'You can do anything so long as you don't apologise.'

'Never try to explain.'

'It does not so much matter what you do as where you are tending.'

'The more sure I am that I am right, the less I care about getting my own way.'

‘The good are not so good as they think themselves, the wicked are not so wicked as the good think them.’

‘All true knowledge contradicts common sense.’

‘Socialism will only be possible when we are all perfect, and then it will not be needed.’

‘An Englishman is not only without ideas, but he hates an idea when he sees it.’

‘True patriotism consists in desiring to be wiser. If we perish, we shall perish of sheer stupidity, from which we show no desire to deliver ourselves.’

‘The clever woman that I meet at dinner gives me back in better words the ideas that I myself have given her.’

‘All the best work has been done by those who with difficulty found time for it in crowded lives.’

‘When you begin to draw definite lessons and morals from history, you at once cease to be searchers after truth, because you have a bias which tends to take you to one side or another.’

‘An untrained mind does not see the nature or the limits of the problem.’

‘The widespread knowledge of the teacher is most of all needed in selecting lines of work for his pupils, as it is so extremely difficult for the student to choose them wisely.’

‘Nothing is so pernicious as mere diffusion. What you need is a definite object and perseverance.’

Speaking about elementary education, he said: ‘Our present system has been on trial long enough to show that it is a failure. We have looked upon education as an end in itself, instead of as a means to an end, the fitting of the children for their work in life.’

‘The one education question is what the child should be taught, and how best to teach it.’

At a Cambridge Syndicate he described the career of an extension lecturer as ‘A mission to enlightened greengrocers.’

‘The two chief means of teaching are exaggeration and paradox. One or other is necessary to attract attention and show reason for independent thought.’

To a lady discussing her children’s education he said, ‘It is wonderful how little mischief we can do with all our trouble.’

‘We are all severe critics of one another: it is the function of the preacher to induce us to turn the power of criticism upon ourselves.’

‘Progress comes from dissatisfaction and renewed effort.’

‘If you want to get on in life, it must be by a steady grind which never loses sight of the end.’

‘The world is still an oyster which has to be opened by one’s effort.’

‘What a man sees depends very much on the eyes he takes to see with.’

‘The sole use of knowledge is to enable you to distinguish between what is true and what is plausible.’

‘The scientific truth is almost diametrically opposed to what the truth would appear to be at first sight.’

‘Action cannot be carried out in terms of omnipotence, but criticism is expressed in terms of omniscience.’

‘The complexity of society hides the fact of the simplicity of life, the joy of which depends on understanding “Thou hast set my feet in a large room.”’

‘To speak simply is more difficult than to speak learnedly.’

‘Art is the veil of beauty over law.’

‘Vulgarity is an inadequate conception of the art of living.’

‘True pleasures pacify and do not excite.’

‘Our appreciation of the world is the basis of our knowledge of its drawbacks.’

‘The appreciation of a principle knocks the bottom out of complaints.’

‘The truth that “one thing is as good as another” must be admitted if one is to emancipate oneself at all from the world—and make anything worth having of life.’

‘It is good to admire when we can, but it is bad to turn a man out of his actual shape that we may be better able to admire him.’

‘Not all need experience, but all need the fruits of experience.’

Freedom means ‘that men wish to do things for themselves, instead of having them done for them.’

‘We cannot improve the world faster than we improve ourselves.’

‘Paradoxes are useful to attract attention to ideas.’

‘More important than the things we do are the things we do not do: more influential than the things we say are the things we do not say.’

‘It is the duty of the newspapers to tell us what to do: it is our duty not to do it. If things were as simple as our critics make them out, we would have done what they advise long ago.’

‘The administrator has to drive the coach: his critics are always urging him to upset it.’

'The struggle for victory is rarely the struggle for truth. If it has to be entered upon, keep coldly to the facts and pay no heed to jibes.'

'There is a temptation to all who are in authority to do something striking to assert themselves.'

'In dealing with ourselves after we have "let the ape and the tiger die," we have to deal with the donkey, which is a more intractable and enduring animal than the others.'

'The English in Ethelbert's day were not likely to take Christianity from the King's wife, because they were much the same then as now, the most obstinate, pig-headed, least to be persuaded of all people.'

'If you plunge enthusiastically into the task of supplying the popular market, you lose the capacity for raising the popular standard.'

'If the writer of the Book of Proverbs were writing in the present day, he would put among the unsearchable things "the clerical mind."'

'I can't endure a man who speaks of the Church as "she."'

'Dogma is simply the maintenance of the historic Christ against imperfect definitions and the tendency of thought that would whittle away His personality and dissolve Him, if the process was allowed to go on long enough, into a simple man.'

'We need seriously to consider whether harm has not been done by the prominence given in our day to the doctrine of the Incarnation over the doctrine of the Atonement. It weakens the sense of sin, which is one of the great bulwarks against unbelief, and through which we live into a larger world.'

'It is amazing how happiness entirely depends on goodness.'

'Happiness is growth into the purpose of the world.'

'Modern philanthropy consoles fearfulness, our Lord rebuked it.'

'Sympathy cannot be cultivated in itself; it has no rules. It is born of insight, and rests on respect. It is the result of all life's training.'

'We confuse wisdom, not with knowledge but with smartness and success.'

'The work of the Church of England is to maintain truth held according to liberty yet with order.'

'The Church of Rome cares for truth and order, but subordinates truth.'

‘The nonconformists care for truth and liberty, but truth is dissolved into opinion. It is hard to maintain the three together, but this constitutes England’s work.’

‘Wisdom is the quality which interprets the universe, and the individual life which forms part of the universe. It is the perception of God’s purpose in the world, and it interprets our own individual share in that purpose. Wisdom is shown by the way in which we look on life and the world. He only is wise who realises that the world of which he forms a part comes from God and goes to God.’

‘The Reformation set Scripture against the Church—and read it without due sense of its historic meaning. It must be read in the sense in which it was written. The Reformation set aside the witness of the Church to the Lord. The reformers regarded Scripture as the revelation, but the object of revelation is the Lord Jesus Christ: God’s purpose to restore mankind, manifested in the person of Christ. Faith is our grasp of Him, a faculty given by God to be used or cast away. Of that revelation Scripture is the record and the Church the witness.’

‘Life has no more to give than the opportunity of loving service.’

‘The only way in which we can help others is by recalling the way in which God has dealt with ourselves.’

‘Personal trust in a person, this is the secret of true religion. Outward things, systems, doctrines, are only useful as they keep open the way to Jesus, and point to Him as the one object of the soul’s desire.’

APPENDICES

I

PRAYER SAID BY THE BISHOP BEFORE THE REMOVAL OF THE BODY OF MR. GLADSTONE FROM WESTMINSTER HALL

‘O ALMIGHTY GOD, with whom do live the spirits of just men made perfect, after they are delivered from their earthly prisons: we give Thee hearty thanks for the life and example of Thy servant, William Ewart Gladstone, whom Thou hast been pleased to call from the toils and troubles of this world to the realm of eternal rest. And we beseech Thee to grant us Thy grace that, as we commit his body to the ground, our hearts and minds may be so moved by the remembrance of his long and manifold labours for the service of mankind, his country and his Queen, begun, continued and ended in Thy faith and fear, that we fail not to learn the lessons which Thou ever teachest Thy faithful people by the lives of those who love and serve Thee: through Jesus Christ our only Lord and Saviour.—AMEN.

II

LETTER FROM THE BISHOPS OF LONDON AND ROCHESTER ON RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

To the Clergy and Laity of the Church of England within the District of the School Board for London

INASMUCH as the question of the future of religious education in Elementary Schools is a matter of grave importance to Churchmen, we have thought it desirable to ascertain, within the district of the School Board for London, what are their desires, and what practical steps can legitimately be taken to give expression to those desires. To this end we invited to deliberate with us privately a number

of those who seemed, by their practical experience and their expressed interest in the question, fitted to represent various forms of opinion. We think it well to lay before those whom it may concern a statement of some general conclusions which we would commend to their careful consideration. It is to be understood that these conclusions are our own, and that those who helped us by their counsel are not to be regarded as necessarily assenting to them.

We would, in the first place, express our deep thankfulness that there is no desire in England to separate secular and moral education from its connexion with the Christian religion. We trust that Englishmen are ready, as they ought to be ready, to make great sacrifices of their individual preferences to the supreme interest of maintaining this connexion; and that they are also ready to consider how the legitimate desires of all religious bodies can be met, and the largest amount of religious liberty in educational matters can be secured. Our object is to press for an extension of that liberty.

We would do so without any reference to past controversies, and in a spirit of entire good will towards existing institutions. We fully recognise the immense advantage which has been conferred on London by the work of the School Board. We admit that the School Board has paid due regard to the interests of religious teaching within the limitations imposed by law. Its work has been most valuable, and we are thankful for it. But for reasons which we proceed to state, its inherent limitations must always, in our judgment, prevent Churchmen from regarding it as adequate for the due maintenance of the Christian Faith as dominant in the formation of character and the direction of conduct.

The present system of undenominational teaching rests upon an attempt, which cannot be ultimately satisfactory, to teach such religious truths as no Christian objects to. It is obvious that a fairer and juster plan would be to teach such religious truths as any body of Christians desired for their own children. Difficulties of arrangement might be pleaded at first against such a plan, and as reasons for regarding the present arrangement as inevitable; but such difficulties need not always be insuperable. There are many reasons which lead to the conclusion that it is most desirable to consider how they can be overcome. We think it well to put before you two considerations on this point.

(1) Undenominational education cannot be what it professes to be. A syllabus of religious instruction may be prepared by the authority of the School Board. We recognise the excellence of the syllabus now in use for London. But the actual teaching given by the teacher inevitably depends upon his own knowledge and his own opinions. It is possible to exclude the actual formularies used by

any religious body ; but these formularies are only interpretations of truth contained in the Scriptures. The individual teacher must, if he be a Christian, belong to some religious body ; and his teaching, just in proportion to his earnestness, must be penetrated by the spirit of the religious body to which he belongs. Religious teaching does, as a matter of fact, in proportion to its vitality, rest upon a denominational basis ; and it is wise and fair to recognise this in a system of national education.

(2) It is increasingly admitted that elementary education is successful in proportion as it supplies those who are taught with a desire to continue their studies after they have left school. Efforts, have been directed to bring children on leaving school into close connexion with Continuation Classes, Technical Classes, and the like. Now in the case of religious teaching, continuation work must necessarily be done by some religious body. The religious instruction given to a child at school cannot go very far. The most important thing that early teaching can do is to attach a child to some church or chapel which will undertake his continuous teaching. Thus, the undenominational system traverses in religious teaching, a principle to which, in secular subjects, it attaches growing importance.

Dealing with the matter simply as one of efficiency in religious education, we cannot escape the conclusion that religious instruction would be most efficient if given on a denominational basis. We believe that this is largely recognised by all who are interested in education as such. Our desire is that the question be regarded as an educational question, apart from controversies which place other considerations before the welfare of the child—which is to us the sole object to be pursued.

In the light of these general considerations, we would define the position which the body of churchmen might adopt towards the question raised by the present condition of elementary education.

It is obvious that the maintenance of voluntary schools, in a condition of thorough efficiency, is of the highest importance as upholding the type of a system which we believe will ultimately prevail. But it is also desirable that the board schools should meet with the utmost sympathy from churchmen, that the excellence as a general rule, within its limits, of the religious instruction given in them should be fully recognised, and that every effort should be made to secure its efficiency, and encourage the teachers who are engaged in giving it. Because the present system is not all that we desire, we should not underestimate its value, nor hold aloof from it. It is a matter of national importance that it should be as good as possible on its present basis.

We look forward to its amendment by a frank recognition of the

actual condition of religious opinion in England. We only ask that the wishes of parents be consulted about the education of their children, and that every child in England should receive instruction in the religious beliefs of the denomination to which its parents belong. This is a recognition of the principle of religious liberty which is so dear to Englishmen. If it be clear that that object is fairly and impartially pursued, it will commend itself as the true solution of present difficulties.

It is well that the first steps towards this end should be taken experimentally by way of supplement. It is by experiment that practical difficulties may be gradually overcome, and the method of supplementing would use to the full, and disturb as little as possible, religious instruction at present given in board schools. Religious instruction, in accordance with the wishes of the parents, might be given on one or two days in each week during the period assigned by present regulations to the purpose of religious instruction. It is greatly to be desired that this teaching should, as far as possible, be given by teachers attached to the staff of the schools. Where this is not possible, religious denominations might be allowed to provide their own teaching, either inside or outside the school.

It is not for us to enter into the details of such a plan, which would require arrangement in each case. But any efforts made for that purpose would be well worth the trouble. Such experiments would be fruitful in results; and a fair trial would do much to remove the perplexity which now besets the minds of very many earnest Christian men and women, about the future of that religious education which is in their eyes a matter of supreme importance in the development of our national life.

Commending what we have written to your consideration in the presence of Almighty God, who has called us to a knowledge of His truth, and has committed it to our keeping,

We are, your faithful servants in Christ Jesus,

M. LONDON :

EDW. ROFFEN.

III

EPITHALAMIUM.

COMPOSED IN 1900

AT last has dawned the long expected day
 When I may claim you mine,
 And clasp you in my arms and bear away
 Your body sweet and fine,
 Of a still finer soul the meet array.

But stay, how can that be?
 Your soul, how can I dare
 To claim it for my care,
 I who have proved my own inconstancy?
 My hold on good is small,
 If I have heard at all
 The mighty trumpet call
 Of what was highest in me, I forgot
 Its claim before some tempting plot
 Of vanity or greed,
 And paid no further heed
 Than was enough to find some paltry plea
 Why I should disregard the thing I did not see.

Now, sweet, you come to me
 Bringing your spirit pure with me to abide
 For ever by my side;
 A gracious monitor of all good things,
 Strong in the insight clear which springs
 From duty done when seen.
 Sadly I think of what I might have been,
 Better and nobler, worthier of your choice,
 Yet as I am you chose me,
 And that election shows me
 That what I might have been, I still may be;
 Therefore I will take courage and rejoice,
 Hearing your pleading voice,
 To arm myself anew that ancient ill may flee.

To thee I turn, O Lord and Master Love,
 Seeing in all, thy endless subtilty.
 Thou caughtest me as I was passing by
 Unheeding, and didst fix my vagrant eye
 On her who was to prove my soul's entirety
 I looked and looked again,
 First seeking to explain
 The charm that stirred me in the head's deft pose,
 The eye's appeal, the rose
 That mantled and then died upon the cheek,
 And when I heard her speak,
 New meaning breathed from each familiar phrase:
 And when I made reply,
 I listened with amaze

To my own voice, for through its swell
 There seemed to breathe a sigh ;
 As when a captive hears a pitying throb
 Amid the senseless clamour round his cell,
 And with a sob
 Tells hopefully once more his tale of woe ;
 My soul e'en so
 Won power its inmost meaning to express.
 So body and soul afire
 With passionate desire,
 I found my happiness
 Summed up in her who summed up all in me.

 Then with new-born humility
 I taught my lips to sue, tutored my will
 Into submission upon hers, until
 I dared to ask her for herself, and she
 By her great answer shed new life on me.
 Such was thy work in me, O sovereign Love,
 But what in her ? How didst thou move
 Her peaceful spirit and tempt it from its rest ?
 Did pity draw her to a soul forlorn,
 That hope might spring new born,
 And her life grow as power stood confest ?

 I know not : but enough of what is past,
 A joyous future I would now forecast.
 No disillusion dim her golden dream,
 But what I seem
 To her may I discover and become ;
 This be the task that waits me in our home,
 Our home—where we the treasure may unfold
 Which clash of soul and sense
 Has cast upon life's shore for us to hold
 As our inheritance.
 Our home—love's throne,
 Whose grateful sway we own :
 We were his slaves, henceforth his subjects free,
 Happy to live beneath his sovereignty.

IV

MARRIAGE HYMN

COMPOSED 1900

O THOU who gavest power to love
That we might fix our hearts on Thee,
Preparing us for joys above
By that which here on earth we see.

Thy spirit trains our souls to know
The growing purpose of Thy will,
And gives to love the power to show
That purpose growing larger still.

Larger, as love to reverent eyes
Makes manifest another soul,
And shows to life a richer prize,
A clearer course, a nobler goal.

Lord, grant Thy servants who implore
Thy blessing on the hearts they blend,
That from that union evermore
New joys may blossom to the end.

Make what is best in each combine
To purge all earthly dross away,
To strengthen, purify, refine,
To beautify each coming day.

So may they hand in hand advance
Along life's path from troubles free ;
Brave to meet adverse circumstance
Because their love points up to Thee.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

WORKS

- History of the Papacy during the Period of the Reformation.* Vols. i. ii pp. xxiii, 453, and xx, 555, London, 1882; iii. iv. pp. xvi, 307 and xii, 314, London, 1887; v. pp. xi, 384, London, 1894. Second edition, under the title 'History of the Papacy from the Great Schism to the Sack of Rome,' 6 vols. 8vo. London, 1897.
- The Age of Elizabeth.* 8vo. pp. xviii, 236, London, 1876. ('Epochs of History' series.)
- Simon de Montfort.* 8vo. pp. xii, 226, London, 1876. ('Historical Biographies' series.)
- The Tudors and the Reformation.* 8vo. pp. vi, 91, London, 1876. ('Epochs of English History' series.)
- Memoir of Sir George Grey.* Privately printed, 4to. pp. 130, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 1884. Reprinted, 8vo. with introduction by Sir Edward Grey, Bart., London, 1901.
- Cardinal Wolsey.* 8vo. pp. vi, 226, London, 1888. ('Twelve English Statesmen' series.)
- Carlisle.* 8vo. pp. x, 215, London, 1889. ('Historic Towns' series.)
- Queen Elizabeth,* with illustrations. 4to. pp. ii, 204, London, 1896. Second Edition, pp. vi, 307 (text only), London, 1899.
- The Story of some English Shires.* 4to. pp. 312, London, 1897: with illustrations. Second Edition, 8vo. pp. 382, London, 1901.
- Primer of Roman History.* 16mo. London, 1875. Many Editions. A French translation by M. Pélicier (Coulomiers, 1885).
- The Shilling History of England,* being an introductory volume to 'Epochs of English History.' 8vo. pp. 139, London, 1879. Reprinted with continuation to 1900 by Louise Creighton, 1904.

ARTICLES, LECTURES, AND ADDRESSES, &c.

- Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini, Pope Pius II,' *Macmillan's Mag.* Vol. xxvii. pp. 113-22, 294-304, 1872. Reprinted in *Historical Essays and Reviews.*
- Dante.' *Ibid.* vol. xxix. pp. 554-63, 1873; xxx. pp. 56-67, 1874. Reprinted in *Historical Essays and Reviews.*

- 'A Schoolmaster of the Renaissance' (Vittorino da Feltre). *Ibid.* vol. xxxii. pp. 509-19, 1875. Reprinted in *Historical Essays and Reviews*.
- 'The Endowment of Research.' *Ibid.* vol. xxxiv. pp. 186-92, 1876.
- 'John Wiclif at Oxford.' *Church Quarterly*, vol. v. pp. 119-41, Oct. 1877. Reprinted in *Historical Essays and Reviews*.
- 'Duties of Guardians with regard to Education.' *Reports of the Poor Law District Conferences*, 1877, pp. 170, 181. *Ibid.* 1878, pp. 142, 148.
- 'A Learned Lady of the Sixteenth Century' (Olympia Fulvia Morata). *Macmillan's Mag.* vol. xlii. pp. 136-44, 1880. Reprinted in *Historical Essays and Reviews*.
- 'Workhouse Management.' *Poor Law District Conferences*, 1881, pp. 80, 81.
- 'Alnwick Castle.' *Magazine of Art*, vol. v. pp. 140-45, 195-200, 1881-1882.
- 'A Man of Culture' (Gismondo Malatesta of Rimini). *Ibid.* pp. 270-77. Reprinted in *Historical Essays and Reviews*.
- 'Clerical Inaccuracies.' *The Clergyman's Magazine*, vol. xviii. pp. 168-76, 1884.
- 'The Northumbrian Border.' An Address delivered to the Archæological Institute at Newcastle-on-Tyne. *Macmillan's Mag.* vol. l. pp. 321-33, 1884. Reprinted in *Historical Essays and Reviews*.
- Ditto, with Appendices, *Archæological Journal*, vol. xlii. pp. 41-89, 1885.
- 'Influence of the Reformation upon England, with special reference to the Work and Writings of John Wiclif,' Carlisle Church Congress, 1884. Reprinted in *The Church and the Nation*.
- Inaugural Address as Dixie Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Cambridge.' Published in *Historical Lectures and Addresses*.
- 'Philip II.' *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Ninth Edition, vol. xviii, 1885.
- 'The Teaching Work of the Church.' Portsmouth Church Congress, 1885.
- 'The Harvard Commemoration.' Written specially for the *Times*, Nov. 8, 1886. Published in the *Times*, Nov. 22, 23, 1886. Reprinted in *Historical Essays and Reviews*.
- 'Hoghton Tower.' *Magazine of Art*, vol. x. pp. 19-24, 68-72, 1887.
- 'The Church and History.' Wolverhampton Church Congress, 1887. Reprinted in *The Church and the Nation*.
- 'The Italian Bishops of Worcester.' Worcester Diocesan Architectural and Archæological Society's publications, 1889. Reprinted in *Historical Essays and Reviews*.
- Two addresses given at St. Mary's, Cambridge, in 1890,—one on 'the Congregationalists,' the other on 'the Baptists,' printed in full in the *Cambridge Chronicle*. Reprinted in *Historical Lectures and Addresses*.
- 'The Fenland.' *Archæological Journal*, vol. xlix. pp. 263-73, 1892. Reprinted in *Historical Essays and Reviews*.
- Christian Ethics.' Folkestone Church Congress, 1892. Reprinted in the *Church and the Nation*.
- 'The Friars.' Three lectures given in St. Paul's Cathedral and reported in full in the *Church Times*, 1892. Reprinted in *Historical Lectures and Addresses*.

- 'What the Church does for the Nation.' *Nye's Popular Illustrated Church Annual*, 1893, pp. 7-11.
- 'Science and Faith.' Birmingham Church Congress, 1893.
- 'Bishop Grosseteste and his Times.' Three lectures given in St. Paul's Cathedral, and reported in full in the *Church Times*, 1895. Reprinted in *Historical Lectures and Addresses*.
- 'The National Church : its Continuity in Order, Doctrine, and Autonomy.' Norwich Church Congress, 1895. Reprinted in *The Church and the Nation*.
- 'Life and Work.' *The Girl's Quarterly*, vol. i. pp. 73-75.
- 'The Abolition of the Roman Jurisdiction.' *Church Historical Society*, 1896. Reprinted in *The Church and the Nation*.
- 'Some Literary Correspondence of Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester.' *English Hist. Review*, vol. x. 99-104, 1895.
- 'Laud's Position in the History of the English Church.' In the *Archbishop Laud Commemoration vol.* edited by W. E. Collins, 8vo. pp. 3-29, London, 1895. Reprinted in *Historical Lectures and Addresses*.
- 'The Imperial Coronation at Moscow.' *Cornhill Mag.* pp. 305-25, Sept. 1896. Reprinted in *Historical Essays and Reviews*.
- 'St. Edward the Confessor.' Address given in Westminster Abbey, Oct. 13, 1896, published in the *Cornhill Mag.* Reprinted in *Historical Lectures and Addresses*.
- 'The Idea of a National Church.' Shrewsbury Church Congress, 1896. Published by the *Church Historical Society*, 1898. Reprinted in *The Church and the Nation*.
- 'The Church under Elizabeth' a Lecture delivered at the Church House, Westminster, April 29, 1896. 8vo. pp. 30. Published in *Historical Lectures and Addresses*.
- 'Church and State.' *Oxford House Papers*, vol. iii. 8vo. pp. 31-44. London, 1897.
- 'The Picturesque in History,' a Lecture delivered before the Royal Institution of Great Britain, Feb. 5, 1897. Published in the *Cornhill Mag.* pp. 305-20, 1897. Reprinted in *Historical Lectures and Addresses*.
- 'The Study of a Country,' an Address given to the Annual Meeting of the London University Extension Students at the Mansion House, April 3, 1897. Published in *Historical Lectures and Addresses*.
- 'Heroes,' an Address given to the Social and Political Education League, Nov. 4, 1898. Published in the *Cornhill Mag.*, pp. 729-40, 1898. Reprinted in *Historical Lectures and Addresses*.
- 'The Educational Value of the Co-operative Movement.' Address given to the Co-operative Congress, May 30, 1898. Published in *Thoughts on Education*.
- 'The Use of Books,' an Address given at the Centenary Celebration of the Liverpool Athenæum, Dec. 20, 1898. Published in *Thoughts on Education*.

- 'The Work of a Librarian.' Address given to a meeting of the Library Association, 1898. Published in *Thoughts on Education*.
- 'The Reformation,' in H. M. Gwatkin's *The Church, Past and Present*. 8vo. pp. 125-35, London, 1900.
- 'A Plea for Knowledge,' an Address prepared for delivery to the Birmingham and Midland Institute, 1900. Specially issued to members of the Institute, 8vo. pp. 26, Birmingham. Published in the *Contemporary Review*, March, 1901. Reprinted in *Thoughts on Education*.
- Acca, Bishop ; Adam de Marisco ; Adrian IV., Pope ; Aidan, Saint ; Augustine, Saint ; Bale, John, Bishop of Ossory ; Baring, Charles Thomas, Bishop of Durham ; Bek, Anthony, Bishop of Durham ; Blamire, Susanna ; Blamire, William ; Boniface of Savoy, Archbishop of Canterbury ; Bowes, Elizabeth ; Bowes, Sir George (2) ; Bowes, Sir Robert ; Bowes, Robert ; Bowes, Sir William ; Brome, Adam de ; Bury, Richard de ; Carilef, St. William de ; Castro, Alfonso y ; Cavendish, George ; Chillingworth, William ; Comin, Robert de ; Crew, Nathaniel, Bishop of Durham ; Fabyan, Robert ; Felix, Saint ; Ferrar, Nicholas ; Fiddes, Richard ; Fish, Simon ; Gainsbrough, William, Bishop of Worcester ; Gigli, Giovanni, Bishop of Worcester ; Graham, Sir James Robert ; Green, John Richard ; Grey, Sir George ; Grindal, Edmund, Archbishop of Canterbury ; Grindal, William ; Habington, Thomas ; Hall, Edward ; Harrington, Sir John ; Harpsfeld, Nicholas ; Heylyn, Peter ; Hodgson, John ; Holdsworth, Richard ; Holt, William ; Howard, Philip, first Earl of Arundel ; Howard, Thomas, second Duke of Norfolk ; Howard, Thomas, third Duke of Norfolk ; Howard, Thomas, fourth Duke of Norfolk ; Howard, Lord William ('Belted Will') ; Inett, John ; Islip, John, Abbot of Westminster ; Jane, Joseph ; Jane, William ; Jewel, John, Bishop of Salisbury ; Ker, Andrew ; Kett, Robert ; Keys, Lady Mary. *Dictionary of National Biography*.

COLLECTED ESSAYS, &c.

- The Church and the Nation*. Charges and Addresses. 8vo. London, 1901.
- Historical Essays and Reviews*. 8vo. London, 1902.
- Thoughts on Education*. 1902.
- Historical Lectures and Addresses*. London, 1903.

INTRODUCTIONS

Introductions to the following volumes :

- Records of the Borough of Leicester*. 8vo. 1899.
- Records of the Borough of Northampton*. 8vo. 1898.
- F. Relton's *English Theological Library*. 8vo. 1898.
- Memoir of Lord Lilford*, by his sister. 8vo. 1900.
- Cambridge Modern History*, 1902.

REVIEWS

- Hodgkin : 'Italy and her Invaders.' The *Times*, August 6, 1880.
 'Modern History,' reviews of new historical publications. *Contemporary Review*, vol. xlv. 280-8, xlv. 144-9, xlvii. 596-603, and 895-902, 1883-1885.
- L. Thuasne : 'Johannis Burchardi Diarium.' *Engl. Hist. Review*, vol. i. p. 165, 1886.
- W. Stubbs : 'Seventeen Lectures on the subject of Mediæval and Modern History.' *Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 369, 1887.
- J. A. Symonds : 'The Renaissance in Italy.' *Ibid.* p. 582. Reprinted in *Historical Essays and Reviews*.
- J. Gairdner : 'Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII.' F. A. Gasquet : 'Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries.' *Ibid.* vol. iii. p. 373, 1888. Reprinted in *Historical Essays and Reviews*.
- J. H. Lupton : 'A Life of John Colet.' *Ibid.* p. 575.
- T. Craig-Brown : 'The History of Selkirkshire.' *Ibid.* p. 791.
- J. F. Smith : 'Martin Luther and the Reformation in Germany.' *Ibid.* vol. iv. p. 777, 1889.
- W. A. Shaw : 'Minutes of the Manchester Classis,' &c. *Ibid.* vol. vi. p. 399, 1891.
- F. Ehrle : *Historia bibliothecæ Romanorum Pontificum.* *Ibid.* p. 379.
- T. G. Law : 'Conflict between Jesuits and Seculars in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth.' *Ibid.* p. 583.
- 'The Excommunication of Queen Elizabeth.' *Ibid.* vol. vii. pp. 81-8, 1892.
- L. A. Burd : 'Macchiavelli's "Il Principe."' Prof. P. Villari : 'Life and Time of Niccolò Macchiavelli.' *Ibid.* p. 354. Reprinted in *Historical Essays and Reviews*.
- F. Nitti : 'Leone X. e la sua politica.' *Ibid.* vol. viii. p. 146, 1893.
- P. Desiderio Pasolini : 'Caterina Sforza.' *Ibid.* vol. ix. p. 766, 1894. Reprinted in *Historical Essays and Reviews*.
- M. de Maulde-la-Clavière : 'La diplomatie au temps de Macchiavel.' *Ibid.* vol. ix. p. 142, 1894.
- Also reviews in the *Manchester Guardian* and the *Academy* between 1871-1884.

CHARGES, &c.

- A Charge delivered to the Clergy and Churchwardens of the Diocese of Peterborough, 1894. 8vo. pp. 69, Peterborough. Reprinted in *The Church and the Nation*.
- The Position of the Church of England.' Address to the Ruridecanal Conferences in the Diocese of London, 1899. 8vo. pp. 24, London. Reprinted in *The Church and the Nation*.
- The Church and the Nation.' A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of London at St. Paul's Cathedral, 1900. 8vo. pp. 39, London. Reprinted in *The Church and the Nation*.

SERMONS

- Sermon preached in memory of the Rt. Hon. Sir George Grey, Bt. in Embleton Church, 1883 ; with an account of the memorial windows. 8vo. pp. 26, Newcastle-on-Tyne, 1883. Reprinted in *Memoir of Sir George Grey*, 1901.
- ‘The Pastor and His People.’ Farewell Sermon preached in Embleton Church, 1884. 8vo. pp. 12, Newcastle-on-Tyne, 1884. Reprinted in *University and other Sermons*.
- ‘The Christian Ministry.’ Sermon preached at the Ordination held in Alnwick, 1884, Newcastle-on-Tyne, 1885. 8vo. pp. 12. Reprinted in *University and other Sermons*.
- Sermon preached before the Sanitary Congress at Worcester, 1889. 8vo. pp. 6, London. Reprinted in *University and other Sermons*.
- Sermon preached before the Folkestone Church Congress, 1892. *Church Congress Reports*, 1892, pp. 24-33.
- A National Mission.’ Sermon preached at the 89th Anniversary of the British and Foreign Bible Society, 1893. 8vo. pp. 19, 1893. Reprinted in *University and other Sermons*.
- Sermon preached at the close of the Birmingham Church Congress, in Worcester Cathedral, 1893. *Church Congress Reports*, 1893, pp. 554-561. Reprinted in *University and other Sermons*.
- Sermon preached in St. Paul’s Cathedral, 1896, on the 195th Anniversary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, 8vo. pp. 16, London. Reprinted in the *Mind of St. Peter*.
- Sermon preached at the close of the London Church Congress, 1899. *Church Congress Reports*, 1899, pp. 439-445. Reprinted in *The Mind of St. Peter*.
- ‘The Hope of the Future.’ Preached in Sandringham Church, 1899. 8vo. pp. 18, London. Reprinted in *The Mind of St. Peter*.
- Sermon preached at the Church Parade of the London Rifle Brigade in St. Paul’s Cathedral, 1900. 8vo. pp. 7, London. Reprinted in *The Mind of St. Peter*.
- ‘Marriage Address,’ in volume of *Marriage Addresses*, edited by Rev. O. P. Wardell-Yerburgh. 8vo. pp. 3-5, London, 1900.

VOLUMES OF SERMONS

- Persecution and Tolerance*. 8vo. pp. 140, London, 1895. (Hulsean Lectures, 1893-4.)
- The Heritage of the Spirit*. 8vo. pp. 216, London, 1896.
- Lessons from the Cross*. 8vo. pp. 132, London, 1898.
- University and other Sermons*. 8vo. pp. 271, London, 1903.
- The Mind of St. Peter and other Sermons*. 8vo. 192, London, 1904.

INDEX

ACADEMY, THE, i. 145, 146
 Academy, The Royal, dinner, ii. 93
 Acland, Mr. Arthur, i. 160, 351
 Acton, Lord, i. 146, 226, 275, 333,
 338, 339, 341, 369, 376, 414 ;
 ii. 203-205, 338, 346, 405, 407
 Additional Services, ii. 298-307
 Address from Peterborough clergy,
 ii. 208
 Adler, Dr., ii. 465
 Æneas Sylvius, i. 147, 331
 Æstheticism in Oxford, i. 46
 Affirmation Bill, The, i. 262
 Agassiz, Dr., i. 365
 Agassiz, Mrs., i. 362
 Agricola, i. 329
 Albany, Duke of, i. 39, 138, 186, 243
 Albert Hall, The, ii. 393-395
 Alexander VI., Pope, i. 262, 265, 368,
 371 ; ii. 106
 Algeria, ii. 92, 93, 144-146
 All Souls' Day, ii. 303
 Alleyne, Foster, i. 23, 41
 Alleyne, Miss, i. 27
 Alnmouth, i. 150
 Alnwick, i. 145, 179
 Alnwick Union, The, i. 179
 American Ambassador, The, ii. 390
 American Bishops, ii. 240
 American writers, ii. 393
 Ancient Mariners, The, i. 52
 Anderson, Mrs., i. 96
 Andronikoff, Prince, ii. 158
 Anglican Orders, Validity of, ii. 176-
 182
 Aphorisms, i. 408 ; ii. 195, 196
 Appleton, Dr., i. 129, 146
 Archæological Congress at Cambridge,
 ii. 78
 Archbishop's Decision, The, ii. 371,
 372, 376-379, 380-381, 397
 Archbishop's Hearing, The, ii. 357, 358,
 370, 371
 Architecture, Fifteenth Century, i. 413
 Armenia, ii. 172, 173
 Armenians, The, ii. 163

Arnold, Matthew, i. 325
 Arnold, Mr. Thomas, i. 40 ; ii. 478
 Arnold, Miss, i. 74 ; *see* Mrs. Humphry
 Ward.
 Asperges, ii. 306, 359
 Association of Tutors, The, i. 60
 Athanasian Creed, The, ii. 69, 427
 Athletics, i. 298
 Austria, ii. 163
 Australian Delegates, The, ii. 439

BALZAC, i. 123
 Balzani, Count, i. 384 ; ii. 79, 445
 Bamfborough, i. 149, 176
 Baptism, ii. 66, 68
 Barbaro, ii. 370
 Baring, Bishop, i. 143, 205
 Barlow, Rev. Dr., ii. 448
 Barlow, Sir Thomas, ii. 464
 Barry, Bishop, ii. 264
 Bateson, Miss Mary, i. 341
 Battenberg, Princess Louis of, ii. 155
 Bayard, Mr. Henry, ii. 226, 232,
 235
 Bayreuth, ii. 97
 Bazaars, ii. 51
 Beam Hall, i. 139
 Beaumont, i. 132
 Becket, Thomas à, i. 319, 382
 Bell, Rev. William, i. 4
 Bells, The Hugh, i. 200
 Benson, Archbishop, ii. 93, 138, 146,
 148, 161, 165, 180, 197, 303
 Benson, Mrs., i. 275
 Benwell Tower, i. 208
 Berrington, Mr. Trevor, i. 180
 Bettwys-y-Coed, ii. 324
 Bevan, Rev. H. E. ii. 266, 448
 Biarritz, ii. 456-459
 Bigg, Dr., ii. 3, 33, 34, 266, 353,
 448
 Biographies, Historical, i. 147
 Birkbeck, Mr. W. J., ii. 147-149, 153,
 155, 158, 237, 448
 Birmingham, i. 64, 381 ; ii. 445

- Birr Castle, ii. 77
 Bishop Auckland, i. 143, 144
 Bishops' Registries, ii. 436
 Bishops, Spiritual jurisdiction of, ii. 187
 Bismarck, Prince, ii. 163, 347, 348
 Black Letter Saints' Days, ii. 306
 Blakesley, Chancellor, ii. 53-55, 95
 Blamire, Miss, i. 268
 Boase, Mr., i. 41
 Bolland, Rev. E., i. 317, 391; ii. 170
 'Bondagers,' i. 155
 Boot Trade, Strike in the, ii. 119-131
 Booth, Mr. Alfred, ii. 338
 Borgia, Caesar, i. 265, 267
 Bosanquet, Mr. Charles, i. 175, 203, 212
 Bowen, Lord Justice, i. 275
 Boyd, C., i. 20
 Boyle, Sir Courtenay, ii. 125-130
 Brace, Mr. C. Loring, i. 358, 359
 Bradgate Park, ii. 13
 Bradlaugh, Mr., i. 262
 Bradley, Dr., i. 128
 Bradshaw, Henry, i. 349
 Bridges, Robert, i. 43, 63, 123, 129; ii. 497
 Briennios, Patriarch of Constantinople, ii. 153
 Bright, Dr., Master of University, i. 60, 128
 British Association, ii. 139
 British Museum, The, ii. 220, 221
 Brixworth, ii. 105
 Brodie, Sir Benjamin, i. 77
 Brodrick, Mr. George, i. 50, 222
 Brooke, Mr. Stopford, i. 180
 Brown, Mr. Harris, ii. 142
 Brown, Mr. Horatio, i. 385
 Browne, Dr. G. F., ii. 97
 Browning, Robert, i. 164; ii. 412
 Bryce, Rt. Hon. James, i. 41, 333, 338, 341
 Bryn Mar, i. 359
 Bugbrooke Church, ii. 15
 Burd's, L. A., edition of the *Principe*, Burgh, i. 308, 309
 Burials, Conduct of, ii. 67
 Butler, Dr., i. 311; ii. 1
 Butler, Mr. Samuel, ii. 83, 84
 Byron, i. 329
 CAIRD, Dr. Edward, i. 26, 27, 50, 129, 249
 Caister, i. 309
 Cambridge, i. 274-277, 297; ii. 2, 141, 320
 Cambridge Modern History, ii. 204, 205
 Cambridge Review, The, i. 277
 Cambridge society, i. 300, 301
 Carlisle, i. 1-3, 73, 80, 384; ii. 99, 169, 171
 Carlisle, Bishop of, ii. 1
 Carlisle Cathedral, i. 2, 25
 Carlyle, Thomas, i. 104, 325; ii. 402
 Carmichael, Sir Thomas Gibson, i. 209
 Cartmell, J. W., i. 5
 Cassiodorus, Letters of, i. 331
 Cathedral School, Carlisle, i. 4
 Catholic customs, ii. 426
 Cattaro, Bocche di, i. 385
 Cettigne, i. 385
 Chamberlain, Mr. Joseph, i. 348; ii. 240
 Charge, London, ii. 424, 428
 Charge, Primary, ii. 48, 95, 96, 119
 Charity Organisation, i. 392
 Charteris, Hon. Hugo, i. 209
 Cheviots, The, i. 148, 149
 Choate, Mr. Joseph, i. 366
 Christian Endeavour, The, ii. 443, 444
 Christmas at Worcester, i. 397
 Christon Bank, i. 155
 Church and State, ii. 372, 383, 384, 395, 431-433, 442, 443
 Church Association, Deputation from, ii. 293-294
 Church Congress, Birmingham, ii. 84
 Church Congress, Carlisle, i. 250
 Church Congress, Exeter, i. 314; ii. 8, 98
 Church Congress, Folkestone, ii. 79, 114
 Church Congress, London, ii. 341, 393-400
 Church Congress, Newcastle, i. 212
 Church Congress, Norwich, ii. 140, 141
 Church Congress, Portsmouth, i. 316
 Church Congress, Shrewsbury, ii. 175
 Church Congress, Wolverhampton, 383
 Church Crisis, ii. 389, 422
 Church, Dean, i. 333, 337
 Church Defence, ii. 383
 Church difficulties, ii. 420, 421
 Church Extension Societies, ii. 23, 25
 Church Historical Society, The, ii. 97, 98, 142
 Church History, Epochs of, i. 345
 Church of England, The, ii. 85, 192, 193, 261, 286, 287, 301-304, 314, 336, 376, 378, 395, 396, 411, 427-429, 442, 447
 Church Reform, i. 349
 Church Reform Union, The, i. 221
 Church Restoration, ii. 14-17
 Church Schools, ii. 47
 Church, The National, ii. 174, 384, 443
 Churches, Open, ii. 14
 Churchill, Lord Randolph, i. 64, 350

Cincinnati, i. 359, 360
 Citizen Sunday, ii. 119
 Clayton, Canon, ii. 60
 Clergy Discipline Act, ii. 452
 Clerical Inaccuracies, Paper on, i. 206
 Clerical Problems, ii. 61-69, 274-283
 Clifford, Dr., ii. 464
 Clifton, i. 64
 Clothworkers, The, ii. 320
 Clough, Miss, i. 300
 Coastguards, The, i. 154
 Cobb, Dr., ii. 289, 290
 Colenso, Bishop, i. 44
 College Chapel Sermons, i. 17, 137, 138
 College discipline, i. 114
 College servants, i. 127
 Collins, Rev. W. E., ii. 97, 142
 Colonial and Continental Church Society, ii. 458
 Colonial Premiers, The, ii. 240
 Communion, Evening, ii. 278
 Communion of sick persons, ii. 276
 Communion Service, ii. 300, 308, 311
 Communities, Religious, ii. 270, 272
 Compton, Bishop, ii. 221
 Compton, Lord Alwyn, i. 311
 Confession, i. 411; ii. 274, 364, 365, 427, 470
 Confirmation of Nonconformists, ii. 63, 65
 Confirmations, ii. 31, 32
 Congregational Union, The, ii. 173, 174
 Connaught, Duke of, ii. 154, 155, 159
 Connor, Sir N., ii. 149
 Constance, Council of, i. 266
 Continental chaplaincies, ii. 273, 457
 Continuity, ii. 379, 380
 Conversation classes, i. 289-293
 Convocation, ii. 294-297, 370, 376
 Co-operative Congress, The, ii. 321
 Co-operative Societies, ii. 117
 Cope, Use of a, ii. 284
 Copleston, Dr., Bishop of Calcutta, i. 17, 22, 23, 25, 29, 34-36, 55, 74, 76, 93, 128, 180
 Cornwall, i. 81
 Corpus Christi, ii. 303
 Costa, Signor, i. 150, 200
 County Council, The, ii. 316
 Covington, Prebendary, ii. 266
 Craster, i. 153, 154, 161, 173
 Craster, Mr. John, i. 173
 Creighton, James, i. 1; ii. 169, 328
CREIGHTON, MANDELL:
 Addresses to ruri-decanal conferences, ii. 245-248, 314, 315
 Addresses to working men, ii. 399
 America, Journey to, i. 355-367
 Amusements, ii. 71, 72

Creighton, Mandell---*continued*
 Architecture, Interest in, i. 340; ii. 14, 139, 466
 Begins 'History of the Papacy,' i. 186
 Birth, i. 1
 Birth of children, i. 133, 139, 185, 188, 200, 259, 381
 Bishop of Peterborough, i. 398, 400, 403, 404
 Business capacities, ii. 11, 58, 59, 221, 273
 Canon of Newcastle, i. 240
 Canon of Windsor, i. 396
 Canon of Worcester, i. 309
 Chairman of the School Attendance Committee, i. 187
 Chairman of the Alnwick Board of Guardians, i. 203
 Character, i. 9, 18, 34-36, 52, 53
 Characteristics, i. 129-132, 198, 199, 203, 212, 224, 254, 255, 284, 302; ii. 219-221, 228, 229, 479-500
 Charge, London, ii. 425-428
 Charge, Primary, ii. 95, 96, 119
 Children, Love for, i. 133, 193-195; ii. 28, 31
 Children, Relations with his, i. 257, 303; ii. 329-333
 Church views, i. 24-26, 54
 Clergy, Relations with, ii. 41-44, 50, 53, 208, 210, 228
 College rooms, i. 67, 68
 Confirmation, ii. 1, 215
 Consecrated Bishop of Peterborough, ii. 1
 Conversation, ii. 163, 229, 255, 256, 500-503
 Correspondence, ii. 274
 Dixie Professor, i. 245, 246
 Editor of the 'Historical Review,' i. 333-344
 Edits, 'Epochs of English History,' i. 182-184; 'Epochs of Church History,' 345
 Education, Views on, i. 168, 243, 317, 390
 Embleton, First visit to, i. 144-146
 Engagement to be married, i. 77
 Enthronement in Peterborough Cathedral, ii. 5
 in St. Paul's Cathedral, ii. 215, 216
 Examiner in Law and Modern History Schools, i. 132, 186
 Examiner, Work as, i. 89, 180, 191, 198, 240, 309, 383
 Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Newcastle, i. 240; to the Bishop of Worcester, i. 352, 353
 Farewell to Embleton, i. 251-254

Creighton, Mandell—*continued*

- Farewell to Peterborough, ii. 206,
207, 208; to Worcester, i. 405
Fellowship, i. 42
Friends, i. 17, 20-23, 30-34, 37-39,
73, 74, 129
Funeral, ii. 464, 465
Guardian of the Poor, i. 179, 204,
205
Habits, ii. 60, 61, 73, 168, 169,
217-219, 221
History, His conception of, i. 279,
280
History teaching, i. 60, 61
Holidays, ii. 168, 169, 241, 242,
249, 324, 391, 444, 445
Illness, ii. 405, 406, 445, 446, 451,
458, 459, 462, 463
Impressions of London, ii. 221-225
Inaugural Lecture as Dixie Professor,
i. 277-282
Interest in art, i. 73
Interest in Women's Education, i. 64
Interviews, ii. 219
Lectures, i. 132, 133, 191, 199,
200, 317-319; ii. 82, 114, 115,
131, 146, 165, 225, 338, 385, 403,
441
Lectures, at Cambridge, i. 275-281,
284-288; at Falmouth and Ply-
mouth, 80-85; at Oxford, 62, 63,
64; at Worcester, 381, 382, 395;
on the Congregationalists and Bap-
tists, 395, 396
Legal decisions, ii. 273
Life as a parish priest, i. 160-172
Life at Peterborough ii. 9-11, 13
Literary work, ii. 70, 71, 86, 87,
143
London, appointment to, ii. 195
Lords, House of, Speeches in the,
ii. 361, 364
Marriage, i. 127, 130
New Year's Message to his clergy, ii.
420
Nonconformists, Relations with, i.
169; ii. 174
Northumberland, Love for, i. 273
Novel reading, i. 30, 80, 199, 214
Objection to Prosecution, ii. 422
Opinions about his work, ii. 261-
264
Ordination, i. 75, 137
Oxford, Decision to leave, i. 140-143
Papers at Church Congresses, i. 250,
251
Parochial visiting, i. 165-167, 179
Peterborough, Relations with city of,
ii. 210
Philosophy, Views on, i. 27
Poems, ii. 326

Creighton, Mandell—*continued*

- Political opinions, i. 200-202, 305-
308, 346-352; ii. 163
Portrait, His, painted, ii. 143
Preaching, i. 76, 132, 133, 138,
162-164, 298, 313; ii. 3, 4, 74,
269, 270
Principal of the Postmasters, i. 58
Public Dinners, ii. 226, 227
Publication of 'History of the
Papacy,' i. 225-232, 368-378;
ii. 86-90.
Pupils, i. 180, 181, 209, 255
Relations with his children, i. 257,
303; ii. 329-333
with clergy, ii. 38-44, 53, 297
with Emmanuel College, i. 295-299
with Newnham Students, i. 299
with pupils, i. 288-295
Ritual opinions, ii. 284, 285
Rural Dean of Alnwick, i. 205, 206
Russia, Journey to, ii. 146-161
Sayings, ii. 503-507
School days, i. 2-10
Select Preacher at Oxford, i. 180
Sermons, i. 133, 137, 185, 200, 208,
254, 398; ii. 15, 74, 78, 80, 85,
91-94, 117, 238, 319, 320, 400,
404, 406
Silver Wedding, ii. 206
Simon de Montfort, Life of, i. 184
Speaking, After dinner, ii. 93
Speeches in the House of Lords, ii.
233, 361, 364, 387; at Harvard,
i. 363; at Carlisle, i. 201; to
working men, ii. 26-28, 85, 98,
114, 115, 117, 118, 381
Speaking, Public, i. 315, 316; ii. 3,
4, 225
Study, Methods of, i. 224, 225
Talk, i. 34-36, 50-55, 292, 296,
297
Tastes, i. 5, 7, 29, 30, 31
Teaching, His, i. 64, 65, 286-292
Travels, i. 69-72, 136, 137, 139,
188, 198, 199, 210, 211, 213, 214,
249, 350, 379, 380, 384, 385, 392,
393; ii. 74, 79, 92, 135, 139, 144-
146, 242-245, 319, 324, 325-328,
388, 391
Tutorship, i. 42
Undergraduate days, i. 16-43
Views on Church matters, ii. 363,
364, 368; on Natural Science, i.
45, 46; on University reform, i.
47, 48, 61
Visitation, ii. 95, 424
Walking, i. 5, 7, 8, 23, 39, 176, 304,
308; ii. 13, 14, 325, 445
Worcester, Life at, i. 312, 313, 317,
318

- Creighton, Mandell—*continued*
 Writings, i. 146, 147, 182-184, 189,
 190, 239, 383, 384
 Creighton, Robert, i. 1, 2, 3
 Criticism, i. 125, 330, 331
 Cromptons, The Henry, i. 129
 Cumberland, i. 81
 Cunningham, Dr., i. 395, 398
 Curates, ii. 37, 267
 Curtis, Mr. Martin, i. 365
- DALBUS, P., *see* Portal, Abbé
 Dalmatia, i. 384, 385
 Dante, i. 64, 80, 115, 125, 139; ii.
 471
 Darwin, Charles, i. 93
 Davey, Lord, ii. 339
 Davidson, Dr. Randall, ii. 1, *see* Win-
 chester, Bishop of
 Deaconesses, St. Andrews, ii. 272
 Deceased wife's sister, Marriage with, ii.
 65
 Devotional Meeting of Bishops, ii. 138
 Diggle, Rev. J. W., i. 65, 89
 Dimock, Rev. N., ii. 448
 Diocesan Calendar, ii. 52
 Diocesan Conference, Durham, i. 207;
 Leicester, ii. 115; London, ii. 236,
 262, 287, 368, 369, 389, 428, 429;
 Newcastle, i. 242; Northampton, ii.
 172; Peterborough, ii. 78, 139
 Diocesan Inspection, ii. 49
 Diocesan Magazine, Peterborough, ii.
 209
 Diocesan Records, ii. 436
 Discipline in College, i. 56-58
 Disestablishment, ii. 95, 347-350, 372-
 374, 376, 384, 430, 431
 Divorce, ii. 69, 275, 322, 323
 Dixie Professorship, The, i. 244, 245
 Dollinger, Dr., i. 337
 Dostoiewsky, ii. 165
 Drama, The, ii. 279
 Dublin Tercentenary, ii. 77
 Duckworth, Sir Dyce, ii. 336
 Dufferin, Lord, ii. 317
 Dunstanborough, i. 149, 176
 Dunster, ii. 441
 Durham Cathedral, i. 9
 Durham School, i. 5-7, 9
 Dutch pictures, i. 104
 Dykes, Dr., i. 9
- EARLE, Dr., Bishop of Marlborough,
 ii. 264
 East Anglian Bishops, Gathering of,
 ii. 81, 100, 142
 East End, The, ii. 269
 East London Church Fund, ii. 435
- Ecclesiastical Commission, The, ii.
 220
 Ecclesiastical Courts, ii. 370, 371
 Ecclesiastical History, i. 279, 281, 285,
 316
 Economics, London School of, ii. 444
 E.C.U., The, ii. 263, 367, 382
 Education, i. 382; ii. 46-49, 96, 108,
 109, 188, 189, 236
 Edinburgh, Duke of, ii. 158
 Edward, Prince, ii. 135
 Eliot, President, i. 361, 365, 381
 Elizabeth, Queen, Life of, ii. 143
 Elizabeth, The Age of, i. 147, 285,
 288, 290
 'Elsmere, Robert,' ii. 101
 Ely, i. 304
 Embleton, i. 139-142, 144-146, 148-
 159, 254, 256; ii. 170, 171
 Embleton Church, i. 151, 234
 Embleton Vicarage, i. 150, 151, 248,
 251
 Emmanuel College, i. 249, 295-299
 Emperor, The German, ii. 404, 405,
 417, 418, 464
 England, Conversion of, i. 241
 English Church, The, ii. 85, 301, 302,
 304
 English Churches on the Continent, ii.
 275, 276
 'English National Character,' Lecture
 on, ii. 166
Entsagung, i. 106-108
 Epochs of English History, i. 182
 'Essays and Reviews,' i. 44
 Esson, Professor, i. 51, 60, 86, 124,
 141, 143
 Eton, ii. 385
 Etruscan tombs, i. 214; ii. 79
 Exeter Hall Meeting, ii. 313, 314
- FALLODON, i. 145, 173, 175, 192; ii.
 99
 Falmouth, i. 64, 80, 81, 83, 132, 133
 Family Life, i. 118, 124
 Fasting Communion, ii. 426
 Fellowships, Married, i. 78, 79
 Fenland, Paper on the, ii. 78
 Ferguson, Mr. Johnson, ii. 118
 Festing, Dr., Bishop of St. Albans, ii.
 81, 142, 230
 Festival of the Three Choirs, i. 381,
 395
 Finland, Archbishop of, ii. 158, 237
 Ford, Miss, i. 4
 Foreign Service, ii. 39-41
 Foresters, The, ii. 279
 Forsythe, Mr. P. T. ii. 97
 Foster, William, i. 20, 23, 31, 33, 43,
 52

- Fotheringhay, ii. 18
 Fowler, Sir Thomas, i. 268
 Fox, Miss Anna Maria, i. 81
 Fox, Mr. Howard, i. 83, 85
 Fox, Mr. Robert, i. 81
 Franciscan Movement, The, i. 319
 Freeling, Rev. N., i. 51, 76, 139
 Freeman, Mr. Edward, i. 244, 336, 339, 351
 French Reformed Church, ii. 273
 Friars, Lectures on the, ii. 82
 Froude, T. A., i. 325, 337
 Fulham Church, ii. 216
 Fulham Palace, ii. 218, 221
 Fund, Bishop of London's, ii. 268
- GARDEN Parties, Fulham, ii. 229
 Gardner, Miss Alice, i. 288, 295, 300, 303
 Garnett, Dr., i. 262, 344 ; ii. 165
 Gennadius, the Patriarch, ii. 150, 151
 Gibbon, i. 123
 Gilman, President, i. 366
 Girgenti, ii. 18
 Girton College, i. 299
 Gladstone, Rt. Hon. W. E., i. 47, 267, 305, 306, 341-343, 348, 350, 406 ; ii. 321
 Gladstone, Miss, i. 299, 300
 Glastonbury Abbey, ii. 241
 Glehn, Robert von, i. 77
 Goddard, Mr., ii. 25
 Goethe, i. 80, 104, 106-108, 119
 'Goodwill,' ii. 318
 Gore, Dr., i. 389 ; ii. 87, 97
 Graglia, ii. 445
 Grammar, ii. 316
 Gray, Mr. G. T., ii. 59
 Greek History, i. 98
 Green, J. R., i. 129, 146, 333
 Green, Rev. C. E., i. 160, 162, 165
 Green, T. H., i. 44, 163, 186, 200
 Gressoney, ii. 445
 Greville Memoirs, The, i. 339
 Grey, Albert, i. 175, 200, 206, 332 ; now Lord Grey, ii. 134, 141
 Grey, Lady, i. 145, 174, 195, 236, 237
 Grey, Lord, i. 164, 175, 234
 Grey, Sir Edward, i. 176, 202, 209 ; ii. 99, 103, 141
 Grey, Sir George, i. 155, 173, 174, 195, 209, 233-236, 251, 254
 'Grieve, David,' ii. 101
 Grosseteste, Bishop, ii. 142, 416
 Grove, George, Sir, i. 147, 161
 Gunson, Rev. W., i. 3, 4, 16, 141
 Gwatkin, H. M., i. 245, 249, 250, 277
- HALIFAX, Viscount, ii. 175-177, 429, 450
 Hamlyn, Mr. V. C., i. 188
 Harcourt, Sir William, ii. 287, 359-363, 372, 449
 Harrisons, The Frederic, i. 129
 Harvard, John, i. 249, 361-364
 Harvard University, i. 355, 361-367
 Haverford University, i. 359
 Headlam, Rev. Stewart, ii. 278
 Hearing, The Archbishop's, ii. 357, 358, 370, 371
 'Helbeck,' ii. 344, 345
 Herbert, Auberon, i. 306
 Herring fishery, The, i. 154
 Heroes, Lecture on, ii. 338
 Hertford House, ii. 441
 Heygate, Mr. W. M., ii. 4, 12
 Hinckley, ii. 18
 'Hinds,' The, i. 155-157
 Historical Biographies, i. 184
 Historical Criticism, i. 330
 'Historical Review,' The, i. 332-344, 357, 369, 377 ; ii. 70, 71
 Historical School, The Oxford, i. 60
 Historical studies at Cambridge, i. 277, 278
 Historical Studies, Board of, i. 282, 284
 Historical study, ii. 110, 111
 Historical Tripos, The, i. 277, 278, 282, 283, 284, 285
 History, Continuity of, i. 287
 History reading, i. 90
 History teaching, ii. 466
 History tutorship, i. 42
 Hodge, Rev. Grose, ii. 12, 51, 82, 210
 Hodgkin, Dr., i. 182, 191, 195-197, 214, 256 ; ii. 497
 Hodgkin, Miss Violet, i. 194
 Holbein, ii. 459
 Holborn Meeting, The, ii. 352-355
 Holden, Dr., i. 6, 13 ; ii. 5, 6
 Holden, Mrs., i. 9, 10
 Holland, Canon Scott, i. 75, 185, 244 ; ii. 465
 Hood, H. J., i. 38, 39, 71, 79, 142, 180 ; ii. 1
 Hood, Mrs., i. 72, 79
 Hope, Band of, i. 172
 Hort, Dr., i. 249, 297, 349, 399 ; ii. 373
 Howard, George, Earl of Carlisle, i. 200, 201
 Howick, i. 175
 Hudson, The, i. 359
 Hull, Canon, ii. 28
 Hulsean Lectures, The, ii. 90, 91, 92, 376
 Hunt, William, i. 149
 Hutton Hall, i. 192

INCENSE, ii. 285, 313, 359, 377, 380-383, 423, 452, 454
 Indulgences, i. 394, 395 ; ii. 87, 106, 108
 Inglesant, John, i. 337
 Inquisition, The, ii. 422
 Irreverence, ii. 27
 Irthlingborough, ii. 16
 Italy, Journeys to, i. 135-137 ; ii. 79, 83, 135, 242, 324, 392
 Ivrea, ii. 244, 392

JAMESON, Dr., ii. 134
 Jebb, Lady, ii. 91
 Jeune, Bishop, ii. 10
 Job, Book of, i. 269, 271
 John, Father, of Cronstadt, ii. 157
 Johnson, Arthur, i. 128
 Johnston, Rev. W. Murdoch, ii. 266
 Jowett, Rev. B., i. 21, 42, 44, 48, 61, 121, 128
 Jubilee, The, i. 379 ; ii. 230, 236-240

KEBLE, Warden of, ii. 141
 Kempe, Mr. C. E., ii. 6
 Kennaway, Sir John, ii. 447, 448
 Kensit, Mr., ii. 215, 287, 295, 424
 Keréief, General, ii. 237
 Keswick, ii. 171
 Ketton Home, The, ii. 51
 Kieff, Metropolitan of, ii. 152, 153
 Kinnaird, Lord, ii. 361
 Kirkandrews, i. 80, 81
 Knighton Fields, ii. 214
 Knox, Dr., i. 63
 Kolde, Professor, ii. 88-90

LAACH, ii. 75-77
 Labouchere, Mr., ii. 110, 123-125
 Laing, Robert, i. 128
 Lambeth Conference, ii. 240
 Land Tenure in Northumberland, i. 237
 Lang, Mr. Andrew, i. 73, 128, 180, 200, 250
 Laud, Archbishop, ii. 335
 Law and Modern History School, i. 39, 41, 42
 Lay readers, ii. 49, 50, 442
 Lea, Mr. H. W. i. 341, 359, 409
 Lee, Mr. Harry, ii. 273
 Legge, Hon. and Rev. A., i. 127
 Leicester, ii. 10, 12, 23-25, 28-31, 47, 50, 82, 100, 113-116, 119, 245, 307, 314
 'Leisure Hour,' The, ii. 71
 Leo X., Pope, ii. 107
 Leo XIII., Pope, ii. 176, 178-180, 182, 183, 206

Leonardo, i. 92, 119, 125
 Leopold, Prince, *see* Albany, Duke of
 'Lessons from the Cross,' ii. 319

LETTERS FROM:

Acton, Lord, i. 228, 339, 369, 371 ; ii. 203-205
 Alderson, Rev. Canon, ii. 198
 Benson, Archbishop, ii. 146
 Brown, Mr. Horatio, i. 232
 Bryce, Dr., i. 232
 Carlisle, The Earl of, i. 232
 Foster, W., i. 31
 Gardner, Miss Alice, i. 403
 Grey, Mr. Albert, i. 247
 Gwatkin, Mr. H. M., i. 245
 Holland, Rev. Canon Scott, ii. 198
 Hull, Rev. Canon, ii. 199
 Labouchere, Mr. H., ii. 199
 Lawrance, Rev. J. T., ii. 199
 Merton Undergraduates, The, i. 142
 Pobiedonostzeff, M., ii. 161
 Prothero, Mr. G. W., i. 402
 Queen, The, ii. 164
 Rogers, Dr. Guinness, ii. 198
 Rutland, Duke of, ii. 199
 Salisbury, Lord, ii. 197
 Schechter, Dr., i. 402
 Stubbs, Dr., i. 243
 Talbot, Dr., Bishop of Rochester, ii. 198
 Temple, Dr., Archbishop of Canterbury, ii. 465
 Ward, Mrs. T. H., i. 247
 Winchester, Bishop of, ii. 147, 197

LETTERS TO:

A. B., i. 268, 321-324
 Acton, Lord, i. 227, 334, 335, 370, 372-375
 Adderley, Hon. and Rev. J., ii. 312
 Ainger, Canon, ii. 270, 283
 Aldridge, Mrs., ii. 440, 444
 Alleyne, Miss, i. 27
 Anonymous, ii. 182, 194, 195, 207, 222, 253, 267, 270, 271, 272, 284, 285, 291, 316, 359, 360, 366, 382, 423, 470
 Archdeacons, ii. 456
 Baker, Rev. R. S., ii. 105
 Balzani, Count, ii. 19, 79, 169, 201, 393, 401, 433, 434, 437, 469
 Barlow, Miss Alice, i. 416
 Barrett, Miss Constance, ii. 184, 225, 467
 Bateson, Miss Mary, i. 394, 408, 413 ; ii. 406
 Bell, Rev. G. C., ii. 7, 108, 183, 188, 190
 Bell, Miss Helen, ii. 109
 Bell, Miss Mary, ii. 400, 461
 Benham, Rev. Canon, ii. 251
 Benson, Archbishop, ii. 69, 179

Letters to—*continued*

- Bickersteth, Mr. Robert, ii. 379, 380
 Birkbeck, Mr. W. J., ii. 179, 181, 302, 356
 Blakesley, Mr. G. H., ii. 95
 Bolland, Rev. E., ii. 170, 171, 391
 Boyd, Rev. F. L., ii. 431, 432
 Boyle, Sir Courtenay, ii. 127-129
 Brace, Mr. C. L., i. 360, 415
 Bridges, Robert, i. 71, 105, 137, 412
 Brown, Dr. G. F., Bishop of Stepney, ii. 215
 Brown, Miss Ethel, i. 397, 409
 Brown, Mr. Horatio, ii. 104
 Browning, Mr. Oscar, i. 183, 191, 244, 248
 Carnegie, Rev. W. H., ii. 104, 335
 C. D., ii. 255-257, 317, 324-328, 343, 394, 397, 406, 407, 408, 418
 Cecil, Hon. Evelyn, ii. 248
 Churchill, Lord Edward, ii. 453
 Clergy, ii. 39-44, 50, 57, 65-69, 274, 275, 277, 278, 280, 281-283, 294, 298, 365, 377, 420, 446
 Cobb, Dr., ii. 372-375, 430
 Collins, Rev. W., ii. 180, 181, 341, 358, 370
 Colombo, Bishop of, ii. 202, 259
 Copleston, Dr., i. 178, 221, 401; *see* Colombo, Bishop of
 Creighton, Basil, ii. 317, 348, 385, 460
 Creighton, Beatrice, ii. 324, 392, 401, 417, 418
 Creighton, Cuthbert, ii. 242, 325, 386, 387, 390
 Creighton, Ella, ii. 214, 233, 235, 404, 406, 445, 446
 Creighton, Louise, ii. 143, 236, 240, 244, 260-262, 379, 380
 Creighton, Lucia, ii. 83, 110, 111, 134, 135, 144
 Creighton, M. E., 177, 234, 268, 340, 350
 Creighton, Walter, ii. 99, 140, 142, 328, 407
 Creighton, Winifred, ii. 100, 203, 216, 221, 223, 242, 251, 255, 348, 388, 403, 404, 405, 445, 459
 Crutwell, Rev. C. T., i. 177, 178; ii. 411
 Dawson, Rev. W. F., ii. 249
 Devine, Mr. A., ii. 467
 Drury, The Rev. T. W., ii. 468
 Dunn, Rev. T. C., i. 241
 Eardley-Wilmot, Rev. Prebendary, ii. 476
 E. F., i. 409, 411, 415

Letters to—*continued*

- Field, Rev. T., ii. 277
 Figgis, Mr. T. N., i. 414
 Finch, Mr. W. G., ii. 282
 Fitzroy, Miss Lilian, ii. 207
 Fleming, Rev. Canon, ii. 308
 Gardner, Miss Alice, i. 289, 409; ii. 22, 186
 Garnett, Dr., ii. 89, 90, 165, 166, 343
 Garfit, Mr. T. Cheney, ii. 356
 Gedge, Rev. H., ii. 29
 G. H., ii. 252, 254, 344, 390, 391, 394, 409, 410, 468, 471
 Gladstone, Miss, i. 299
 Gladstone, Rt. Hon. W. E., i. 342
 Gledstone, Rev. J. P., ii. 475
 Glehn, Mrs. von, i. 130
 Glehn, Louise von, 76, 78, 79, 81-89, 90-126
 Glyn, The Lady Mary, ii. 462
 Goddard, Miss Margaret, ii. 249
 'Goodwill,' Editor of, ii. 318
 Gosse, Mr. Edmund, ii. 110, 111
 Green, Mrs. J. R., i. 238, 263, 266, 267, 330; ii. 92, 105
 Grey, Mr. Albert, i. 221, 262, 346
 Grey, Sir Edward, i. 202, 203, 305-308, 346, 347, 350, 385, 408
 Grey, Sir George, i. 209
 Grey, Lady, i. 236; ii. 103, 222, 239-242, 342, 401
 Gwatkin, Mr. H. M., i. 245, 249, 276, 309; ii. 469
 Halifax, Viscount, ii. 48, 176, 177, 185
 Hall, Rev. H. E., ii. 300, 302, 312, 350
 Harcourt, Sir William, ii. 449
 Harrison, Mr. H. S., ii. 349
 Hassard, Rev. R. S., ii. 304
 Haweis, Rev. H. R., ii. 202
 Hocking, Rev. W. J., ii. 473
 Hodge, Rev. E. Grose, ii. 43, 61, 261
 Hodgkin, Dr., i. 197, 229, 231, 237, 262, 263, 265, 268, 346
 Holland, Canon Scott, ii. 194, 201
 Holmes, Rev. W. P., ii. 466
 Horsfall, Mr. T. E., ii. 334
 Hull, Rev. Canon, ii. 201
 Hutton, Rev. A. W., ii. 411
 James, Rev. A. O., ii. 43
 Jebb, Mr., i. 65
 Jessopp, Dr., ii. 140
 Kennaway, Sir John, ii. 447
 Kensit, Mr., ii. 288, 291, 294, 312
 Knox, Rev. E. A., ii. 63-65
 Kolde, Professor, ii. 88
 Lacey, Rev. T. A., ii. 183

Letters to—*continued*

- Lea, Mr. H. C., i. 377, 414; ii. 87, 92
 Lee, Mr. Harry, ii. 452
 Leney, Rev. L., ii. 17
 Lilford, Clementina Lady, ii. 167, 206
 Lilly, Mr. W. S., i. 407, 410, 412; ii. 105, 108, 184, 193, 468, 469
 Linklater, Rev. R., ii. 311
 Longman, Mr. C. J., i. 182, 183, 189, 190, 233, 334, 338, 339, 341–345; ii. 70, 86, 91, 347, 352
 Loraine, Rev. N., ii. 352
 Lyttelton, Hon. and Rev. A. T., ii. 347
 McArthur, Dr., Bishop of Bombay, ii. 367
 MacColl, Rev. Canon, ii. 476
 McCormick, Canon, ii. 265, 301
 Melville, Canon, ii. 5, 300
 Mitchinson, Bishop, ii. 48, 59, 103
 Nieces, ii. 412, 413, 415, 437–441
 Nixon, W. A., i. 8, 15
 Norwich, Bishop of, ii. 189
 Oelsner, Mr. H., ii. 471
 Oldroyd, Rev. A. E., ii. 46, 142
 Oliver, Rev. W. E., ii. 307
 Orford, Rev. H., ii. 115, 129, 205
 Pease, Mr. A. E., i. 181, 215–219, 230; ii. 475
 Pease, Mr. Howard, ii. 20, 224, 225
 Pease, Mr. J. W., i. 273, 401
 Pease, Miss Ella, i. 192, 193, 220, 329; ii. 473
 Percival, Rev. L. J., ii. 216
 Phear, Dr., i. 355–362
 Phillips, Mr. Alison, ii. 187
 Pobiedonostzeff, M., ii. 250
 Poole, Mr. R. L., ii. 70, 283, 334, 337, 338, 340, 343, 369–370, 376, 401
 Porter, Rev. A. S., i. 413
 Potter, C. A., i. 28, 30, 40–43; ii. 20
 Powell, Mr. York, i. 333
 Pupils, i. 219, 293, 294, 411; ii. 21, 102
 Raikes, R. T., i. 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 30, 32, 33, 34, 52, 68, 69, 71
 Richardson, Mr. Wigham, ii. 131
 Robinson, Rev. Canon Armitage, ii. 454
 Rochester, Bishop of, ii. 251, 351
 Rogers, Dr. Guinness, ii. 200, 472
 Roundell, Charles, Mr., ii. 190, 192
 Rowsell, Rev. —, ii. 252
 Rural Deans, ii. 376

Letters to—*continued*

- Salisbury, Bishop of, ii. 180
 Salisbury, Lord, ii. 231
 Short, Rev. S., ii. 16
 Sidgwick, Professor H., ii. 186, 347
 Sinclair, Archdeacon, ii. 265
 Smith, Mr. T. K., ii. 45
 Statham, Mr. F., ii. 349
 Stern, Rev. J. F., ii. 279
 Stocks, Rev. Canon, ii. 29–31, 38, 42, 47, 50, 58, 68, 120, 129, 133
 Suckling, Rev. R. A. J., ii. 304, 305
 Talbot, Rev. E., i. 400 (*see* Rochester, Bishop of)
 Taylor, Mr. John J., ii. 333, 334
 Temple, Dr., Archbishop of Canterbury, ii. 371
 Terry, Mr. J., ii. 260
 Thomas, Professor, i. 365, 402
 Thursfield, Mr. J. R., i. 134, 220, 400; ii. 172
 Thursfield, Mrs. J. R., i. 247, 320, 350
 Trevelyan, Rev. W. B., ii. 354, 355
 Ward, Miss Gertrude, ii. 234
 Ward, Mrs. T. H., ii. 101, 200, 344, 345, 444, 471, 474, 478
 Watson, Canon, ii. 40, 42, 45, 52, 183
 Westall, Rev. H., ii. 423, 424
 Widdrington, Miss Dorothy, i. 274, 275
 Wigg, Rev. S. W., ii. 46, 47, 52
 Wilberforce, Dr., Bishop of Newcastle, i. 246, 251, 353
 Wilkinson, Bishop, ii. 275, 276, 457
 Williams, Rev. Alan, ii. 41
 Wilson, Rev. H., ii. 382
 Wilson, Rev. Robert, i. 247
 Winchester, Bishop of, ii. 147, 435, 453–455, 462
 Winnington-Ingram, Dr., Bishop of Stepney, ii. 310
 Villiers, Prebendary, ii. 353, 354
 Yates, Canon, ii. 32
 Letter-writing, i. 329
 Levens Hall, ii. 234
 Liberal Party, The, ii. 342
 Liberty, i. 112; ii. 27, 192, 259, 320, 331, 342, 345, 400
 Library, The Cambridge, i. 303
 Library in Peterborough Palace, ii. 7
 Lichfield, Bishop of, ii. 1
 Liddon, Dr., i. 47, 122
 Lightfoot, Archdeacon, i. 58
 Lightfoot, Dr., Bishop of Durham, i. 205, 207, 208, 212, 337

- Lilford, Lord, ii. 166, 176
 Limits, Recognition of, i. 109, 112
 Lincoln, Bishop of, ii. 68, 134
 Lincoln, Rector of, i. 117
 Little, Canon Knox, i. 311-313
 Liverpool Athenæum, The, ii. 338
 Llanfairfechan, ii. 391
 Local Customs, i. 171, 172
 Local Examinations, i. 49
 Local Records, ii. 436, 437
 London House, ii. 218, 219, 221, 225, 317
 London Reform Union, The, ii. 119, 403
 London University Commission, The, ii. 339, 340
 Longman, Messrs., i. 147, 333
 Longman, Mr. C. J., i. 224
 Lords, House of, ii. 387, 407
 Loughborough Liberal Club, ii. 117
 Lowell, Mr. James, i. 249, 361, 363
 Lowry, Rev. H. C., i. 4
 Lucerne, Lake of, ii. 388, 389
 Luther, Martin, ii. 86, 88, 89, 267
 Lymington, Lord, i. 209
 Lyttelton, Hon. and Rev. A. T., i. 349; ii. 12, 33-35, 99, 266

 MACDONNEL, Sir Schomberg, ii. 162
 Mackarness, Dr., Bishop of Oxford, i. 75
 Macmillan's Magazine, i. 145, 147
 Mafeking, ii. 441
 Magee, Dr., i. 398; ii. 3-5, 32, 36
 Mahommedans, The, ii. 343
 Maine, Sir Henry, i. 128, 275, 306, 349
Maladie du Siècle, The, i. 326
 'Manchester Guardian,' The, i. 123, 146
 Manchester and Sheffield Railway, ii. 133
 Mandell, Sarah, i. 1, 2, 5
 Mandells, The, i. 2
 Market Harborough, ii. 47
 Marlborough College, i. 80, 303
 Marriage, ii. 324
 Marriage laws, The, ii. 172
 Marriage questions, ii. 68, 69
 Married Fellowship, i. 85-87
 Marsham, Dr., Warden of Merton College, i. 17, 20
 Martineau, Dr., ii. 472
 Mary-le-Bow, St., ii. 1
 Mashonaland, Dr. Knight Bruce, Bishop of, ii. 51
 Mason, Canon, ii. 97
 Mass, The term, ii. 426
 Mayflower, Log of the, ii. 230-232
 Melville, Canon, i. 310-313, 353; ii. 5

 Memorial Windows in Embleton Church, i. 234, 235
 Mendicants, Rise of the, i. 285, 287
 Merton Chapel, i. 24, 66, 129
 Merton College, i. 16, 17, 50, 51, 56, 57, 142, 148
 Merton Undergraduates, The, i. 142, 143, 147
 Merton, Walter de, i. 148
 Meyer, Mr. F. B., ii. 464, 465
 Middlemarch, i. 127
 Middleton, Professor, i. 303
 Midland Institute, The, ii. 385
 Mill, John Stuart, i. 27, 49
 Mission at Northampton, ii. 26
 Missions, ii. 50
 Missions, Foreign, ii. 446, 447
 Missions, School, ii. 278
 Mistchertsky, The Princess, ii. 155
 Mitchinson, Bishop, ii. 59
 Mommsen, Professor, i. 329
 Monte Casino, ii. 135
 More, Sir Thomas, ii. 184, 193
 Morley, Mr. John, i. 250
 Morris, William, i. 93
 Moscow Coronation, ii. 146-161
 Moule, Professor, ii. 448
 Mozley, Dr., i. 128
 Müller, Professor Max, i. 128
 Municipal Churches, ii. 446
 Music, Church, i. 315

 NATIONAL Portrait Gallery, ii. 220
 Natural History Museum, The, ii. 220
 Navy Mission, ii. 133, 134
 Newbolt, Canon, ii. 50, 448
 New Testament Criticism, i. 330, 331
 Newcastle, i. 148; ii. 99
 Newcastle, See of, i. 208
 Newcastle Diocesan Calendar, i. 240
 Newcastle Diocesan Conference, i. 242
 Newcastle Diocesan Society, i. 243
 Newnham College, i. 288, 289, 295, 299, 300; ii. 22, 110
 Newnham Students, i. 341
 Newton-by-the Sea, i. 153, 154, 197
 Newtown Linford, ii. 13
 Niagara, i. 359
 Nixon, W. A., i. 8
 Nonconformists, Relations with, ii. 63, 280, 282, 283
 Norba, i. 213
 Norfolk, i. 308
 Normandy, ii. 139
 North Evington, ii. 214
 Northampton, ii. 10, 12, 23, 26, 113, 114, 119, 207
 Northampton Trades Council, ii. 124, 125
 Northborough, ii. 17

Northcote, Sir Stafford, i. 23
 Northumberland, i. 151, 310; ii. 141
 Northumberland, History of, i. 239
 Northumbrian characteristics, i. 157
 Northumbrian dialect, The, i. 157
 Northumbrian friends, Present from, i. 273
 Norton, Mr. Charles Eliot, i. 249, 357, 360, 361, 363
 Novels, i. 120, 121, 126; ii. 20, 496

ODDFELLOWS, The, ii. 117
 Oldroyd, Rev. A. P., ii. 45
 Oliphant, Lawrence, i. 265
 Order of Divine Compassion, ii. 272
 Ordinations, i. 275, 353, 354; ii. 5, 32-37, 265-267
 'Origin of Species,' The, i. 45
 Ornaments Rubric, The, ii. 313, 379, 431
 Osnaburgh Street Conference, ii. 296
 Oxford, i. 16, 44, 47-49; ii. 97

PALMER, Archdeacon, i. 137
 Pan-African Conference, The, ii. 444
 Pan-Anglican Conference, The, ii. 240
 Papacy, History of the, i. 190, 222-232, 345, 354, 368-378; ii. 71, 86-90
 Papillon, Mr. T. L., i. 51, 52
 Paravicini, Mr., i. 16
 Parker, Dr., ii. 464, 465
 Parnell, Mr., i. 350
 Parochial visiting, i. 165-167
 Pastoral, Creighton's School, i. 10-15
 Pater, Walter, i. 46, 93, 128; ii. 111, 112
 Patronage, ii. 265
 Pattison, Mark, i. 48, 62, 135, 143
 Pauli, i. 264
 Peace Meeting, ii. 336, 337
 Pease, Miss Ella, i. 188
 Pease, Mr. Alfred, i. 180, 347; ii. 93
 Pease, Mr. J. W., i. 182, 195, 208
 Pease, Sir Joseph, i. 187; ii. 495
 Peases, The Howard, ii. 390
 Peel Towers, i. 151
 Peile, Dr., Master of Christ's College, ii. 91
 Pember, Mr. and Mrs. G., i. 129
 Pendower, i. 192
 Penitentiary Association, Worcester, i. 315
 Peploe, Preb. Webb, ii. 448
 Percival, Rev. L. J., ii. 217, 218
 Persecution, ii. 362, 450
 Personality, ii. 212

Peterborough, ii. 4-9, 207, 210
 Peterborough Cathedral, ii. 8, 9, 94, 337, 338
 Peterborough Chapter Library, ii. 9
 Peterborough, Dean of, ii. 429
 Peterborough, Diocese of, ii. 23
 Peterborough Palace, ii. 6, 7; entertainments at, 71, 72, 73, 74
 Petrarch, i. 268
 Phear, Dr., i. 297, 355
 Phillips, Mr. Faudel, ii. 216
 Phillips, Rev. S., ii. 97
 Philippot, Dr., Bishop of Worcester, i. 352, 399
 'Picturesque in History,' The, ii. 225
 Pienza, i. 210
 Plato, i. 113
 Plummer, Dr., i. 345
 Plymouth, i. 80, 81, 83
 Pobiedonostzeff, M., ii. 149, 150, 153, 155, 156, 160, 161
 Pole, Cardinal, i. 287
 Poole, Mr. R. L., i. 333
 Poor Law Conference, i. 187
 Porcelli, Colonel, ii. 452
 Portal, Abbé, ii. 176, 177
 Porter, Sir Alfred de Bock, ii. 220
 Portinscale, ii. 444
 Potter, C. A., i. 28, 30
 Poverty of the clergy, ii. 44-46
 Powell, Mr. York, i. 183, 333
 Prayer, ii. 414
 Prayers for the Dead, ii. 435
 Preaching, ii. 283, 389, 390
 Presbyterians, i. 169, 170
 Prevention of Corruption Bill, ii. 387, 388
 Price, Professor Bonamy, i. 128
 Primers, First shilling, i. 146
 Prince Consort Prize, i. 283
 Professor, Work of a, i. 61, 62, 281, 283
 Professorship, Regius, at Oxford, i. 243
 Progress, ii. 255
 Prosecution, ii. 452-455
 Prothero, Mr. G. W., i. 277, 282
 Public Morality, Council for Promotion of, ii. 386
 Pusey, Dr., i. 44, 45, 47

QUADRILATERAL, The, i. 20, 40, 43
 Queen, The, ii. 100, 101, 155, 159, 164, 215, 239, 338, 403-405, 409, 439, 441, 464

RABBI, The Chief, ii. 386, 464
 Raikes, R. T., i. 20-26, 32, 33, 40, 73, 89

- Rechabites, The, ii. 67
 Rede Lecture, The, ii. 137, 165
 Reformation, The, i. 250; ii. 380, 425, 430
 Religious Education, ii. 46-49, 248, 249, 333-335
 Renan, i. 106
 Requiem Masses, ii. 303, 306
 Research, The Endowment of, i. 61, 62
 Reservation, ii. 310-313, 352, 359
 'Revue Historique,' The, i. 339
 Richmond Park, ii. 446, 459
 Ricketts, Mr. Compton, ii. 385
 Ridgeway, Dr., Bishop of Kensington, ii. 264
 Ritual difficulties, ii. 55-57, 284-310
 Rivington, Messrs., i. 147
 Robertson, Rev. Dr., ii. 448
 Robertson, Mr. George, i. 175, 179, 252
 Robinson, Rev. Canon, ii. 448, 451
 Rochester, Bishop of, ii. 165, 230, 333
 Rome, i. 213, 214; ii. 135
 Rome, Church of, ii. 349, 375
 Roman Claims, ii. 183
 Roman History Primer, i. 146
 Roman Priest, Admission of a, to Anglican Church, ii. 66
 Roman terminology, ii. 294, 296
 Roman Wall, The, i. 196, 329
 Romanes Lecture, The, ii. 165, 166
 'Romola,' i. 126
 Rose, Rev. A., i. 296, 304, 356
 Rosebery, Lord, ii. 465
 Rosse, Lord and Lady, ii. 77
 Round Table Conference, The, ii. 428, 429, 447-451
 Roundell, Mr. C. S., i. 50
 Rousseau's Confessions, i. 101
 Rubric, The Ornaments, ii. 356
 Ruskin, John, i. 105, 128, 325
 Ruspini, Mrs., ii. 272
 Russia, ii. 385
 Russia, The Emperor of, ii. 152, 153, 156-159, 336
 Russia, Relations of, with England, ii. 161-163
 Russian Church, The, ii. 161, 162, 175, 237, 473
 Rural Deans, Conference of, ii. 74, 84
 Rural Deaneries, ii. 446
 Ruri-decanal Conferences, ii. 59
 Ryle, Professor, ii. 448
 St. Alban's, Holborn, ii. 304-306
 St. Andrew's Deaconess House, ii. 272
 St. Augustine, ii. 252
 St. Cuthbert's, Philbeach Gardens, ii. 291
 St. Dominic, i. 288
 St. Edmund's, Northampton, ii. 16
 St. Ethelburga's, ii. 288-291
 St. Francis, i. 103, 288
 St. Gabriel's, Willesden, ii. 270
 St. Hilda's Church, ii. 3
 St. Hilda's Settlement, ii. 319
 St. James's Church, Leicester, ii. 25
 St. James's, Piccadilly, ii. 248
 St. Luke, Guild of, ii. 336
 St. Martin's, Leicester, ii. 115, 116
 St. Mary-le-Bow, ii. 215
 St. Paul, i. 103
 St. Paul's Cathedral, ii. 215, 236, 237, 400
 St. Stephen's, Westbourne Park, ii. 249
 Salisbury, Lord, i. 267, 340, 396, 398, 399; ii. 147
 Sand, George, i. 80, 102, 126, 184
 Sanday, Rev. Professor, ii. 448
 Sandringham, ii. 134, 135, 404, 405, 417
 Sanitscheff, M., ii. 150
 Sargent, Rev. H. W., i. 24
 'Saturday Review,' The, i. 96
 Saunders, Mr. Bailey, ii. 339
 Savonarola, ii. 442
 Savory, Sir William, i. 63
 Sayce, Professor, ii. 200
 Scepticism, ii. 408
 Schools, Public, ii. 183
 Schoolboard Election, ii. 248
 Schooldays, i. 5-15
 Science and Faith, Paper on, ii. 84, 85
 Scott, Mr. C. P., i. 89, 129
 Seeley, Professor, i. 277, 278, 282, 286, 291, 336, 339; ii. 138
 Selwyn College, ii. 141
 Sergius, The Grand Duke, ii. 156
 Services, Additional, ii. 298-307
 Services, Daily, i. 161
 Services, Occasional, ii. 300, 351, 359
 Services, Special, ii. 31
 Sévigné, Madame de, i. 330
 Sforza, Bona, ii. 106
 Shadwell, Mr. C. L. 50, 51
 Shakespeare, William, i. 119, 120, 125; ii. 260
 Shakespeare Readings, i. 191
 Shilling History, The, i. 189, 190
 Shires, Articles on the English, ii. 71
 Shirley, W. W., i. 21
 Shoe industry, The, ii. 23
 Sicily, ii. 18, 19
 Sitwell, Sir George, i. 209
 Sixtus IV., i. 371, 374

SABLER, Mr., ii. 154

Sacerdotal Pretensions, ii. 191

Saintsbury, G., i. 17, 21, 23, 29, 30, 129, 222

- Smith, Mr. George, ii. 440
 Smith, Mr. Goldwin, i. 61
 Smith, Mr. P. V., ii. 448
 Smith, Professor Henry, i. 128
 Social and Political Education League,
 ii. 338
 Society, i. 110, 121, 124, 128, 323
 Somerset, Lady Henry, ii. 226
 Spain, i. 393, 394
 Spanish Inquisition, The, i. 371, 374
 Spence, Mr., i. 170
 Spencer, Herbert, i. 49
 Staal, M. de, ii. 148
 Stamford, Earl of, ii. 369, 448
 Stanley, Dean, i. 92
 Stanton, Canon, i. 349
 Steel, Mrs., ii. 226
 Stepney, Bishop of, ii. 376
 Stewart, Hon. Fitzroy, i. 209
 Stocks, Canon, ii. 113, 120, 210
 Strasnoy, Convent of, ii. 154
 Streatfeild, Rev. W. C., i. 164
 Stubbs, Bishop, i. 10, 41, 60, 61, 128,
 186, 243, 337; ii. 10
 Suckling, Rev. R. A. J., ii. 304-306
 Suffragan Bishops, ii. 264, 347
 Sunday Newspapers, ii. 387
 Supplementary Epistles and Gospels,
 ii. 303
 Symonds, Mr. J. A., i. 376; ii. 90
 Sympathy, i. 101, 114, 116, 120
 Syndicates, Cambridge, i. 303
 Syracuse, ii. 18
- TAINE, M. H., i. 98, 99
 Talbot, Dr., i. 51, 180; *see* Rochester,
 Bishop of
 Talbot, Mrs., i. 222
 Tanner, Mr. J. R., i. 291
 Taormina, ii. 18
 Tasso, i. 268
 Teaching, ii. 185
 Temper, The ecclesiastical, ii. 264
 Temperance Meetings, ii. 51
 Temperance Society, Church of Eng-
 land, i. 172
 Temple, Dr., Archbishop of Canterbury,
 ii. 51, 180, 197, 227, 286, 288, 295,
 465, 491
 Temple Church, The, ii. 74
 Tennyson, i. 123, 164
 Thackeray, i. 114, 120
 Thicknesse, Dr., Bishop of Leicester
 ii. 59, 131
 Thirlwall Prize, i. 283
 Thomas, Professor, i. 359
 Thorpe, Archdeacon, i. 6
 Thorpe, Mrs. i, 180
 Three Hours' Service at Worcester, i.
 397; in St. Paul's Cathedral, ii. 319
- Thursfield, Mr. J. R., i. 56. 73, 200,
 214, 215, 250
 'Times,' The, i. 365
 Titian, i. 125
 Tlemçen, ii. 145
 Toleration, ii. 293
 Topley, Mr., i. 176
 Townships, Northumbrian, i. 239
 Toynbee Hall, ii. 8, 74, 224, 226
 Toynbee Travellers' Club, ii. 229
 Transubstantiation, i. 415
 'Tressady, Sir George,' ii. 200
 Trevelyan, Sir Charles, i. 176
 Troitsa Monastery, The, ii. 160
 Truro, Bishop of, ii. 99
 Tudors, The, i. 288
 Tudor, Mary, i. 287
 Tuke, Dr., i. 81
 Turner, Dr., Bishop of Islington, ii.
 264
- ULLESWATER, ii. 241
 Unbelief, i. 112
 Undenominational Christianity, ii. 191
 Undenominationalism, ii. 245-247
 Undergraduates, i. 297, 298
 Uniformity, Act of, ii. 371
 Unity, ii. 259, 396, 397, 427
 Universities, German, i. 134
 University Commission, i. 47
 University Extension, Lecturing, i.
 293, 380
 University Reform, i. 47, 48, 134
 University Tests, i. 47
- VAL D'AOSTA, ii. 392
 Varallo, i. 210
 Vaughan, Canon, ii. 130
 Vaughan, Cardinal, ii. 177, 341
 Venice, ii. 104
 Verrall, Dr., i. 301, 302
 Vestry, The, ii. 183
 Veto, The Bishops', ii. 452-456
 Visiting Committee, The Bishops', ii.
 386, 387
 Visitor, Office of, ii. 270, 271
 Viterbo, ii. 79
 Vittorio Emanuele, i. 188
 Voluntary Schools, ii. 46, 47, 419
 Voluntary Schools Act, ii. 232, 233
 Voluntary Schools Union, ii. 333
- WACE, Rev. Dr., ii. 448
 Wade, Sir Thomas, i. 400
 Wafer, Use of, in Holy Communion,
 ii. 282
 Wagner, Richard, ii. 97, 461

- Wakeman, Mr. Offley, ii. 7, 239
 Wales, Prince of, ii. 134, 148, 235, 237, 239, 418
 Wales, Princess of, ii. 100
 Wallace, Mr. W., i. 86, 124
 Wantage Sisters, ii. 51
 War, The South African, ii. 401-406, 418, 420, 460
 Ward, Dr. A. W., i. 333
 Ward, Mr., Head of the Masters' Federation, Leicester, ii. 123-125
 Ward, Mr. T. H., i. 77, 128
 Ward, Mrs. T. H., i. 40, 200; ii. 1, 234
 Ware, Professor, i. 358
 Warner, Mr. Townsend, i. 304
 Webb, Mr. and Mrs. Sidney, ii. 226, 444
 Webb Peploe, Prebendary, ii. 429
 Wells, Bishop of Bath and, ii. 241
 Welsh Disestablishment, ii. 139
 Welsh Suspensory Bill, ii. 82, 95
 Westcott, Dr., Bishop of Durham, i. 414; ii. 139
 Westminster Abbey, ii. 1
 'Westminster Gazette,' The, ii. 320, 339
 Whist Club, College, i. 23
 Wiclif, John, i. 319
 Wilberforce, Dr., Bishop of Newcastle, i. 240
 Wilkins, Mr. H. M., i. 51, 59, 89
 Wilkinson, Bishop, ii. 151, 273, 457
 Wilkinson, Prebendary, i. 186
 Williams, Mr. T. O., i. 197
 Wilson, Mr. Robert, i. 58, 59, 66, 127, 128, 250; ii. 251
 Wimbledon Common, ii. 221
 Winchester, Bishop of, ii. 146, 324, 361, 490
 Windsor, ii. 100, 101, 164, 403, 405
 Wine, Use of Unfermented, ii. 61, 62, 280, 281
 Winsor, Mr. Justin, i. 341, 365
 Wolvercot, i. 76
 Wolsey, Cardinal, i. 383
 Women's degrees, ii. 186
 Women, position of, i. 96, 97, 99
 Wood, Canon, i. 310, 311
 Woodman, Mr., i. 238
 Woods, Rev. H. G., i. 73, 128
 Worcester, i. 312, 315, 317; ii. 11
 Worcester, Canonry of, i. 309, 310, 312
 Worcester Cathedral, i. 310, 311, 313
 Chapter, The, i. 310, 311, 314
 Improvements at, i. 389
 Schools at, i. 389-391
 Students' Association, i. 392
 'Worcester Herald,' Letter to the, i. 390
 Wreck of the 'Padre Stefano,' i. 197
 YATES, Canon, ii. 32
 York, Duke of, ii. 135

THE END

▼ KR-509-637

